

The copyright of this thesis vests in the author. No quotation from it or information derived from it is to be published without full acknowledgement of the source. The thesis is to be used for private study or non-commercial research purposes only.

Published by the University of Cape Town (UCT) in terms of the non-exclusive license granted to UCT by the author.

**Disjunctions and Convergences: A Study of Stakeholders'
Perceptions of Public Participation in Service Delivery in Cape Town's
Blikkiesdorp**

Shakira Maharaj

(MHRSHA015)

A [minor] dissertation submitted in [partial] fulfilment of the requirements for the award
of the degree of Master of Development Studies

Faculty of the Humanities

University of Cape Town

2012

COMPULSORY DECLARATION

This work has not been previously submitted in whole, or in part, for the award of any degree. It is my own work. Each significant contribution to, and quotation in, this dissertation from the work, or works, of other people has been attributed, and has been cited and referenced.

Signature:

Date:

The financial assistance of the National Research Foundation (NRF) towards this research is hereby acknowledged. Opinions expressed and conclusions arrived at, are those of the author and are not necessarily to be attributed to the NRF.

UNIVERSITY OF CAPE TOWN

GRADUATE SCHOOL IN HUMANITIES

DECLARATION BY CANDIDATE FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTER IN THE FACULTY OF HUMANITIES

I, Shakira Maharaj of 7 Wakefield Road, Rondebosch, Cape Town, 7700

do hereby declare that I empower the University of Cape Town to produce for the purpose of research either the whole or any portion of the contents of my dissertation entitled

Disjunctions and Convergences: A Study of Stakeholders'

Perceptions of Public Participation in Service Delivery in Cape Town's

Blikkiesdorp

in any manner whatsoever.

CANDIDATE'S SIGNATURE

DATE

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank the people who made this thesis possible. Thanks to my supervisor, Jacques de Wet for his support. Thank you to both my parents who fully supported me in every possible way; without them I would never have had this opportunity. Thanks to my family, friends and boyfriend who encouraged every step of the way. Thanks to all The City of Cape Town municipality officials and members of the Public Participation Unit who were always generous with their information and their time. And last but not least, many thanks to Bern de Kock, without whom I would never have been able to undertake this research.

University of Cape Town

DECLARATION

- 1 I know that plagiarism is wrong. Plagiarism is to use another's work and to pretend that it is one's own.
- 2 I have used the _____ convention for citation and referencing. Each significant contribution to, and quotation in, this essay/ report/ project/ assignment from the work, or works, of other people has been attributed, and has been cited and referenced.
- 3 This essay/ report/ project/ assignment is my own work.
- 4 I have not allowed, and will not allow, anyone to copy my work with the intention of passing it off as his or her own work.

Signature

Abstract

This study aimed to investigate the disjunctions and convergences between key stakeholder groups' perceptions of a public participatory relationship between The City of Cape Town Municipality and the Blikkiesdorp community. The key instruments for this research were semi-structured interviews, observation periods and documentary sources which included The White Paper on Local Government (1998), The Batho Pele Handbook (2009) and the National Policy Framework of Public Participation (2007). This analysis was conducted on a single case study in order to gain in-depth information about key stakeholder perceptions. I used Arnstein's ladder (1969) as a theoretical framework because it provided me with a platform to discuss different types of public participation. The key findings of this thesis were that i) national policies, which are related to public participation, are inconsistent, ii) perceptions of key stakeholders regarding public participation (conceptually and procedurally) are inconsistent and iii) the ambiguous language of public participation allows key stakeholder groups to have different perceptions of public participation. Disjunctions between key stakeholder groups' perceptions and as well as between national policy documents are shown to be detrimental to public participation processes and people-centred development.

CONTENTS

Chapter 1: Introduction	10
Background: Blikkiesdorp	11
1.1 Problem statement	12
1.2 Central Research Question and Sub questions	13
1.3 Objectives of the study	13
1.4 Outline of thesis	14
Chapter 2: Conceptualisation research problem	15
2.1 Central Research Question	15
2.2 Key Concepts	15
2.2.1 People-centred development	15
2.2.2 Participation and public participation	16
2.2.3 Public service delivery	18
2.2.4 Key stakeholder groups	19
2.3.5 Disjunctions and Convergences	19
2.3 Arnstein's Ladder of Public Participation	21
2.4 Reasons for choosing Arnstein's Ladder	23
2.5 Critique of Arnstein's Ladder	23
Chapter 3: Methodology	26
3.1 Research Design	26
3.2 Case Study Framework	26
3.3 Data Collection	28

3.3.1 Observation	28
3.3.2 Interview Style	29
3.3.3 Sampling and Sampling Procedure	30
3.3.4 Documentary Sources	31
3.4 Data Analysis	31
3.5 Self-evaluation	32
3.5.1 Value of the Study	32
3.5.2 Critique of methodology	33
3.5.3 Critique of Interview Schedule	33
3.5.4 Adherence to my ethical guidelines	35
3.5.5 Limitations of the Study	36
Chapter 4: Findings	
4.1 Analysis of the state's public participation policy	37
4.1.2 White Paper on Local Government	37
4.1.3 Batho Pele Handbook	38
4.1.4 National Policy Framework on Public Participation	41
4.2 Municipal managers perspective of Public Participation	43
4.2.1 Municipal managers understanding of the concept	43
4.2.2 Municipal Managers' view of the state's implementation of public participation	44
4.2.3 Public Participation Unit's meeting with the Blikkiesdorp Community	47
4.2.4 Municipal managers' perspective of the potential of public participation	49
4.3 Service Providers perspective of Public Participation	51
4.3.1 Service Providers' understanding of the concept	51

4.3.2 Service Providers' view of the state's implementation of public participation	52
4.3.3 Service Providers' perspective of the potential of public participation	55
4.4 Community leaders' perspective of Public Participation	57
4.4.1 Community Leaders' understanding of the concept	57
4.4.2 Community Leaders' view of the state's implementation of public participation	58
4.4.3 Public Participation Unit's meeting with the Blikkiesdorp Community	59
4.4.4 Community leaders' perspective of the potential of public participation	62
4.5 Key Disjunctions	64
4.5.1 Disjunction within policy	64
4.5.2 Disjunction between perceptions	64
4.5.3 Disjunction between language and delivery of public participation	65
Chapter 5: Discussion	66
5.1 Public Participation	66
5.2 Ambiguity in Public Participation	67
5.2.1 Disjunctions between stakeholder group perceptions	67
5.2.2 Disjunctions between public participation policy and public participation delivery	69
5.2.3 Summary	71
Chapter 6: Conclusion	72
6.1 Key Findings	73
Reference list	76
Appendix	83
1. Interview release form	84

2. Transcription of Interview (Respondent 3)	85
3. Extract from Observation notes (Community experience)	93
4. Extract from Observation notes (Service provider experience)	95
5. Minutes from meeting (the City of Cape Town and Community leaders)	97
6. Interview Schedule	104

University of Cape Town

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

In this chapter I will set out an introduction to my research, and provide a provide outline of my research question and thesis.

This thesis will deal with public participation to demonstrate that the processes and language involved in public participation are ambiguous. South Africa has maintained a people-centred stance towards public service delivery since 1995. It's first democratic government introduced the Reconstruction and Development Programme (RDP) in an attempt to address the apartheid legacy of racially-based unequal distribution of public services. The RDP and its policies were informed by a people-centred theory, which included notions of participatory development and the extensive use of public participation processes in order to achieve appropriate service delivery (Cameron: 1996).

In 1996 the RDP policy was replaced by the Growth, Employment and Reconstruction Programme (GEAR) which was heavily influenced by neo-liberal theory. Despite this trend, there are a number of policy documents that have continued to draw on people-centred principles and language, and the broad-based participation of ordinary citizens in service delivery. The state has maintained a stance towards a people-centred services, and advocated that these should be partially achieved through public participation. This has been evident in national policy documents.

In 1997 the white paper on Transforming Public Services outlined the eight Batho Pele principles including participation, which aim to shape public service policy. Concepts of participation are also articulated in the White Paper on local government (1998). The National Framework for Public Participation (2007), sets out the commitment of the state to implement public participation in public service delivery (amongst other practices). The handbook on Batho Pele principles (2009) was published in an effort to circulate a guide to implementing principles, which sets out aims for consultation. Finally, the Revised Strategic Plan of Public Services (2011) aims to foreground public service delivery in public participation. While there is an overall orientation towards people-centred services, national policies are informed by different principles and consequently the policies are theoretically and administratively incoherent and even contradictory. This is described in more detail in my discussion of national policy.

There appears to be a conscientious effort by the state to promote public participation in public service delivery to the end that it will establish people-centred service delivery. Why then do citizens, who are meant to be the beneficiaries, complain that they are not involved in their own development? Where does the problem lie? My thesis examines these questions about public participation in the context of public service delivery in Cape Town's Blikkiesdorp. My analysis will emphasise the use of ambiguous language drawn from people-centred rhetoric as one of the main problems with public participation processes.

1.1 Case Study Background: Blikkiesdorp

The Symphony Way Temporary Relocation Area, which has been nicknamed Blikkiesdorp by residents, was initially created in 2008 to temporarily house residents evicted from the N2 Gateway project houses (De Bruijn, 2010: 43). The Blikkiesdorp dwellers illegally occupied new houses built by the provincial government, and were evicted by the state. A court interdict instructed the City of Cape Town to build emergency housing for evicted residents. Blikkiesdorp was quickly constructed behind the Cape Town International Airport by the City of Cape Town Municipality. When constructing the transit camp, the City of Cape Town exceeded the bare minimum guidelines for emergency housing by including free water, subsidised electricity and a toilet for shared by four families. However, many residents feel that services provided have failed to provide them with a decent quality of residence since 2008.

New residents moved into Blikkiesdorp since 2008, and the total number of estimated residents is now between 7000 and 8000 people (Respondent 11: 2011) and 1671 housing units (which have been constructed as temporary shelters), however this number is contested by a member of Mylife NGO who states the number of current residents sits at 19000. Blikkiesdorp currently accommodates "squatters from Salt River, backyarders from Delft who occupied N2 Gateway houses and later Symphony Way and residents relocated from the Spes Bona Hostel TRA in Athlone" (De Bruijn, 2010: 44). The growth in the population of Blikkiesdorp is a major social problem, and residents complain that services are severely inadequate to accommodate their growing numbers.

Observations recorded during my numerous field visits to Blikkiesdorp confirm the poor service delivery. Blikkiesdorp was created as a temporary residential area in response to a need for emergency housing, but has been accommodating the same people for up to 4 years. Many residents feel undermined by the state because they are dissatisfied by the quality of service delivery. I have observed the efforts of the City of Cape Town officials and community leaders to improve service delivery through participatory methods (largely in the form of meetings between service providers, local government and community leaders). All parties involved are making a genuine effort to improve service delivery.

Even with these good intentions, participatory processes are failing to deliver the expectations of community members, and are satisfying the needs of local government (as demonstrated in my findings chapter). This has created negative feelings towards The City of Cape Town officials in community leaders (as is also demonstrated in my findings chapter). In this case, public participation processes (as they have been implemented in the past) may be degrading the relationship between The City of Cape Town and community members because it has dissatisfied community leaders. Considering the good intentions of the state and the community to improve public service delivery through public participation, I aimed to uncover reasons why public participation might be failing in Blikkiesdorp.

1.2 Problem Statement

There is a policy prescription for public participation in South Africa, and an emphasised logic that public participation processes are needed in order to address the crises of poor service delivery. Considering the empirical evidence that 'people-centred' public service delivery is failing, I examine policy and practice and disjunctures (and convergences) between policy intentions, perceptions by stakeholders and the consequences for implementation. This research explored disjunctions between perceptions and experiences of public participation by key stakeholders in order to highlight how the ambiguity around participation is affecting the state's implementation of participatory processes.

1.3 Central Research Question:

What are the disjunctions and convergences in the different stakeholders' perceptions of public participation in service delivery in Cape Town's Blikkiesdorp and the consequences for public participation processes in the context of development?

This study was focused on the perspectives and experiences of different stakeholder groups in a participatory relationship. There is evidence of a participatory relationship between the community and The City of Cape Town, which demonstrated by meetings, participatory initiatives and field officers who interact regularly with community members. My study investigates what this relationship means for key stakeholder groups.

'Key stakeholder groups' included a residential perspective, and service provider perspective and a municipal managerial perspective. Participants in the service provider and managerial groups who are officials for the City of Cape Town reflected their own views and experiences, and do not necessarily reflect The City of Cape Town as an organisation.

This study investigated the perceptions of samples from these three different stakeholder groups in an effort to locate disjunctions between perceptions and experiences of participation. I used Arnstein's ladder (1969) as my theoretical framework to discuss disjunctures and convergences using her typologies. Her framework of public participation provided me with the language to locate public participation as understood by each stakeholder group. While this study is small-scale, it does serve to demonstrate there are more disjunctures than there are convergences and this undermines public participation policies. This study lays the foundation for a larger scale study.

1.4 Objectives of Study

I focused on a single case-study for the purposes of this research. I used qualitative methodology and observation techniques to collect my data. My sample included a total of 12 in depth interviews. I conducted my observation over a period of 6 months, which allowed me to contextualise my interview findings. My technique of analysis was to comb the data for common major themes and compare findings. I then reflect on these findings with reference to pertinent literature.

1.5 Outline of Thesis

Chapter 1 aimed to provide an introduction to the study including the context of the study and the case study. Chapter 2 will provide a brief background of Blikkiesdorp. Chapter 3 will present the central research question, sub questions and key concepts. Chapter 4 will explain why I adopted Arnstein's ladder (1969) as my theoretical framework, and critique the model. Chapter 5 will discuss my methodology and research design. Chapter 6 presents my findings. Chapter 7 will present my discussion, which critically reflects on my findings. Chapter 8 will suggest my recommendations. Chapter 9 is my conclusion, which will summarise my thesis and provide concluding comments.

University of Cape Town

CHAPTER 2: CONCEPTUALISING THE RESEARCH PROBLEM

In this chapter I set out key concepts and questions that are used in my central research question and sub-questions.

2.1 Central Research Question:

What are the disjunctions and convergences in the different stakeholders' perceptions of public participation policy for service delivery in Cape Town's Blikkiesdorp, and the consequences for public participation processes in the context of people-centred development?

Sub-questions:

How do different stakeholders perceive and experience public participation?

What are the convergences and disjunctions in the stakeholders perceptions of public participation?

What are the consequences of disjunctions and convergences for public participation processes in the context of people-centred development?

2.2 Key concepts:

I now define the following key concepts: people-centred development, participation and public participation, public service delivery, stakeholders, and disjunctions and convergences.

1. People-centred development

People-centred development rose as an equity-led paradigm in response to growth-led models of development. This alternative development visions proposes that the well-being of people should be focal to development ideology and practice. Korten (1990:67) describes people-centred development as

a process by which the members of society increase their personal and institutional capacities to mobilise and manage resources to produce sustainable and justly distributed improvements in their quality of life, consistent with their own aspirations

2. Participation and public participation:

I drew on Arnstein's (1969, David et al.: 2010 and Bishop and Davis: 2002) conceptualisation of participation. Arnstein (1969) addresses mobilisation described by Korten (1990) as public participation. She discusses public participation across a scope of typologies. These levels of participation are related hierarchically on an imaginary ladder with "public or citizen control" at the top and "manipulation" at the bottom. I now briefly describe each of the eight levels.

i.) Public or citizen control

Public control is the highest level of public participation. At this point, the public is able to control a project or program, and is also in charge of managerial and policy aspects, and is able to negotiate conditions under which "outsiders" are able to affect the projects or programs (Arnstein, 1969: 226)

ii.) Delegated power

Delegated power is when the public acquires dominant decision-making (but not total) power over a project or program, and in order to resolve differences, "power-holders need to start the bargaining process rather than respond to pressure from the other end" (Arnstein, 1969: 226)

iii.) Partnership

Partnership is the point at which power is distributed through groups, and decision-making responsibilities are shared (Arnstein, 1969: 224). Structurally, forums or public boards are set up with ground rules, and no one group can unilaterally make a decision or change those rules (Arnstein, 1969: 224). This is considered authentic participation, and requires the following; "an organized power-base in the community to which the citizen leaders are accountable; when the citizens group has the financial resources to pay its leaders reasonable honoraria for their time-consuming efforts; and when the group has the resources to hire (and fire) its own technicians, lawyers, and community organizers" (Arnstein, 1969: 224)

iv.) Placation

Placation involves a few handpicked members of the public to serve on boards or public bodies. While this process still involves some form of tokenism (Arnstein, 1969: 222), the intensity of placation depends on 2 things; “the quality of technical assistance they have in articulating their priorities; and the extent to which the community has been organized to press for those priorities” (Arnstein, 1969: 222)

v.) Consultation

Consultation is the process in which people are free to give their opinions, however there is no assurance that these opinions will be taken into account in any decision-making (Arnstein, 1969:221). Consultation is characterised by participation for the sake of going through the motions of participation (Arnstein, 1969: 221). In these processes, participation does not achieve social transformation or power redistribution.

vi.) Informing

Informing is centred around informing citizens of their rights and responsibilities. While Arnstein (1969) feels that this could be the first important step towards authentic public participation, she feels that the information flow is often emphasised as a one-way flow of information, which leaves no room for growth towards more authentic forms of participation.

vii.) Therapy

The focus is to shape the public's attitudes to conform with those in power. On this level, citizens are engaged in programs or initiatives to educate or counsel them so that their thinking is in line with power-holders (Arnstein, 1969: 221). Activity is focused on socialising and people so that they act in accordance with power holders (Arnstein, 1969: 221). For example, instead of providing better or more health care services in an area that requires them, the state would run workshops on personal hygiene. This fails to deal with core issues surrounding health care service delivery.

viii.) Manipulation

At the bottom of the ladder, the public is placed into powerless advisory councils. The process of public participation is distorted into a public relations tool because it's purpose is to create public support for the state, not to include any degree of public influence over state decision-making (Arnstein, 1969: 220).

Manipulation and Therapy are considered forms of non-participation, where those without power are "educated" by those who have power (Arnstein: 1969). Informing and Consultation are considered forms of tokenism, whereby those without power have "an ear and a voice" (Arnstein, 1969: 218). In these instances, there is no assurance from power-holders that opinions or suggestions will be heeded. Placation is a higher form of tokenism where those without power are allowed to advise those who have power, however power-holders still have the right to reject opinions (Arnstein, 1969: 219). Partnership, Delegated Power and Citizen Control are all considered forms of participation with increasing power vested in the public (Arnstein, 1969:219). While I understand Arnstein (1969) largely equates the two, I feel the opposite ends of the ladder both concentrate power in one party. In these extremes, the ladder prescribes participation as a wrest for power instead of an aim towards partnership.

3. Public Service delivery:

While public services refers to all those services provided for civil society by the state, the primary research in this study is connected to the public services delivered by the city of Cape Town to residents in Blikkiesdorp. The City of Cape Town provides municipal services to residents (e.g. water, sewerage, sanitation, public housing, solid waste). These services are free of charge with the exception of electricity (which is subsidised). The role of the public sector is to design and implement policies, programs and projects that aim to fulfil the states wider socio-economic goals (Davids et al, 2009: 53). This is reflected in my discussion of (national) public participation policy as a pretext to local level perceptions and experiences.

4. Stakeholder groups:

This refers to different interest groups or role players involved in public service delivery. For the purposes of this study I am looking at perceptions residents, a state service provider and City of Cape Town managers. The residential perspective includes community leaders who reside in Blikkiesdorp. I chose to focus on community leaders because I felt they were most likely to have more extensive experience with local government. The service provider perspective includes officials from The City of Cape Town who provide public services to residents. Specifically, these service providers all worked in the Housing Department at the City of Cape Town. The managerial perspective includes officials from the City of Cape Town who manage and implement public participation policies and mandates through initiatives or monitoring and evaluation (these officials are in the Public Participation Unit and the Integrated Development Planning Unit). While both of these perspectives come from local government, I felt it was pertinent to divide them into two groups because they yield different perspectives. It is important to note that state officials discuss *their* opinions as service providers and managers and do not represent the City of Cape Town as a whole.

5. Convergences and disjunctions

Convergences refers to similar perceptions or experiences. Disjunctions refers to diverging experiences and perceptions. With respect to experiences and perceptions, 'similar' referred to experiences that could be grouped together because they had similar characteristics, eg. experiences that were positive for similar reasons. Disjunctions referred to experiences or perceptions of the same phenomena that had marked differences, eg the same phenomena was experienced positively by one group and negatively by another.

Arnstein's theory is appropriate for this discussion because it articulates different levels of public participation, which are linked to the practice of participation in the real world. Arnstein (1969) argued that participation varies across scope and depth, and created eight possible levels of public participation. I used Arnstein's theory to assess the levels participation that are referred to in various national policies linked public participation as well as each of the stakeholders understandings of participation in order to compare them

and observe disjunctions and convergences. These disjunctions and convergences had both positive and negatives consequences for people-centred development.

2.3 Arnstein's ladder of Public Participation

Arnstein's ladder organises different notions of participation as levels on a scale of possibilities rather than a single act (Bishop and Davis, 2002: 18). Using this scale, we can rank eight possible levels of participation as the ladder progresses from manipulation (as the lowest form of public participation), to Public or Citizen Control (which is understood as the highest form of participation). It represents a hierarchy of participation levels, and shows that the language of "participation" can refer to a number of different actions and processes. Arnstein's model (1969) provided me with a platform to discuss public participation from the perspective of different key stakeholder groups. Using her typology, I was able to demonstrate convergences and disjunctions between key stakeholder groups' perceptions. This framework also influenced my methodology by encouraging me to use qualitative methods so that I could gain in depth information to discuss subtle differences in perceptions and conceptual understandings of key stakeholders.

Arnstein (1969) presents public participation as a process that should be encouraged to incrementally evolve more authentic forms of public participation. If we accept Arnstein's view of participation, we should recognise that public participation should be ultimately aimed at social reform so that there is redistribution of power and resources. This implies that the public must be empowered and capacitated, and without efforts towards empowerment, public participation is not authentic. Arnstein (1969) argued that full citizen participation in projects or programs equates to dominant citizen power over that project or program; and that public control is the highest form of public participation. Public participation is understood as the redistribution of power so that the previously excluded are deliberately included by the powerful in political and economic decision-making processes. This is aimed at inducing social reform so that those who were previously excluded can share in the benefits of society (Arnstein, 1969: 218)

Arnstein (1969) fails to address how and why the public will 'receive' power, which implies a naive understanding of how power works in society. She never looks at why the powerful give their power to ordinary citizens, or how ordinary citizens will wrest power from the

powerful. In the context of this research, it would be valuable to refine the model by discussing power and power redistribution in more detail.

2.3 Reasons for Choosing Arnstein's ladder

Considering the gaps in Arnstein's ladder, I looked at other measurements of participation, namely Pretty, Guijet, Scoones and Thompson's (1995) seven typologies of participation and Oakly and Marsen's (1991) continuum of participation. David et al's (1995) typologies represent different conceptions of participation, which include; passive participation, participation in information giving, participation by consultation, participation for material incentives, functional participation, interactive participation and self-mobilisation (Pretty et al: 1995). While these typologies are all substantial, I found that Arnstein's ladder presented a better measure of progress by ranking levels of participation, instead of listing categories.

Oakly and Marsen (1991) created the Community Development Model as a spectrum of actions by communities. This spectrum of actions includes four modes: the anti-participatory mode, the manipulation mode, the incremental mode and the authentic public participation mode (Davids, Theron and Maphunye, 2009: 117). The assumption is that the public aims to move from anti-participation mode to authentic public participation mode. While this continuum satisfies the need to measure progress, it does not define typologies. Because of this, I found it wasn't as useful as Arnstein's model to this research because the typologies were essential to compare perceptions and experiences.

Of the various models of public participation that I considered, Arnstein's was the most detailed and comprehensive and therefore I decided to use it as the basis of my analytical framework. This does not mean that Arnstein's model is without flaws. I discuss these later in my critique of Arnstein's model.

2.4 Critique of Arnstein's ladder

Arnstein's ladder completely ignores context, which implies that participatory relationships are grounded in neutral space. I disagree with this implication, and align with the concept of invited space which is derived from power cube theory that asserts that no spaces of participation are power neutral (Miraftab: 2004, Taylor: 2007 and Gaventa: 2005). Invited spaces are those spaces that participants join because a powerful group has extended an 'invitation'. An example of this is when local government initiates a public meeting, or includes community members in dialogue (like ward councillors). Essentially,

all participatory spaces are 'invited spaces', and are ultimately controlled by those who extend the invitation (ie the powerful groups that allow the interaction), and these spaces are dictated by the motivation of the more powerful group. In this type of interaction, those with less power are often undermined because of influential power dynamics. This concept could help address existing power dynamics and attitudes of key stakeholder groups in an effort to demonstrate how they impact on public participation relationships. Arnstein's ladder fails to take concepts of power into consideration, and I suggest that her model should be refined to include a more substantial analysis of power.

Public participation models should address public participation from the perspective of all key stakeholder groups; otherwise it is too one-sided to establish a collective solution to issues like public service delivery. Arnstein's ladder of participation addresses public participation purely from the perspective of the public, and leaves out the institutional and bureaucratic consideration. The model should be refined to include both the perspective of powerful state officials and ordinary citizens to enhance the practice of public participation.

Arnstein (1969) recognises the fact that the ladder does not account for real world obstacles; "In the real world of people and programs, there might be 150 rungs with less sharp and "pure" distinctions among them" (Arnstein, 1969: 218), and in that way also oversimplifies the real world operationalisation of participation. While this is true, it is a criticism of all models of participation; all models of public participation are generalised, and therefore cannot account for real world nuances. This is therefore not only a weakness of Arnstein's model, but of models in general.

Arnstein's ladder provided a good typology, and a common framework of language to apply to the study. The use of Arnstein's ladder in my analytical framework allowed me to discuss convergences and disjunctions because it provided a common language to discuss different experiences and perceptions of public participation. Arnstein's ladder discusses public participation largely from the perspective of the community, and fails to address the needs and responsibilities of local government. I also felt that Arnstein's ladder (1969) which culminates in Citizen Power makes the assumption that citizen power is the goal of public participation. This assumption might not always be true or desirable for all public

participation. Engaging with any model in real world situations is difficult and complex . To address this, I moved away from 'weighing' each type of participation but rather focused on how each groups' experience and understanding of public participation was potentially different. This was only possible through using Arnsteins ladder (1969) as an index. The model is simple to understand, and provides value to all discussions about public participation. I am convinced that the use of Arnstein's ladder in this research was an appropriate but I recognise that this framework requires further refinement.

University of Cape Town

CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

This chapter will discuss my choice of research design, data collection, sampling and analysis process.

3.1 Research Design

The research was designed as a descriptive case-study, and represents the most complete description of understandings and perspectives of public participation that I could generate. I produced this description so that I could reveal disjunctions and convergences in the perspectives on public participation by various key stakeholders and the positive and negatives consequences for the practice of public participation. I aimed to investigate the actions and attitudes that fuel social actions and relationships in the everyday environment, and these nuances proved integral to my research. This research project used a case study methodology, and I undertook mixed methods research over 6 months (March 2011 until August 2011). This focused study of multiple perspectives on public participation in order to identify disjunctures and convergences required a single social context. The public participatory process and the associated social context of Blikkiesdorp constitute that case study.

Common sense understandings, personal experiences, and perceptions of public participation are valuable in my efforts to understand disjunctions and convergences. I aimed to generate a thesis that would point out real world problems with participation in an effort to improve public participation processes. Stephenson and Papadopoulos (2006) found that the articulation of every day experience creates commonalities and counter-discourses. Analysing personal experiences and perceptions within key stakeholder groups has allowed me to recognise such counter-discourses and commonalities to evaluate the effects on public participation processes and outcomes.

3.2 Case study framework

Case studies are in-depth studies of a single social phenomenon (Feagin, Orum and Sjoberg: 1991). My central research question requires that I represent the key stakeholders' perspectives of public participation. Considering I was researching 'complex multivariate conditions' rather than just isolated variables, and was 'relying on multiple sources of data' (interviews, policies and observation notes), case-study methodology was

appropriate for my research (Yin, 2003: xi). The relationship between The City of Cape Town and the community of Blikkiesdorp serves as an instrumental case (Silverman, 2000: 139); this study relates to how the concept of participation affects development practice in a wider context. My unit of analysis (Yin: 2003) in this study consisted of municipal officials who work for The City of Cape Town and Blikkiesdorp community leaders. Individuals were identified into 3 different key stakeholder groups; namely community leaders, municipal managers and service providers.

Gray (2004) and Yin (2003) suggest that researchers use multiple forms of data in order to generate in depth data. Considering this, I used observation, interviewing methods and documents to collect data. Yin (2003) suggests case study researchers emulate the scientific method of research by following steps that guide natural scientific research. Two of these steps focus on establishing a hypothesis and rival hypothesis. I did not establish either of these because of the nature of my research (as a social science descriptive study), however I did formulate a central research question and followed the remaining of the 'emulated scientific method' steps (Yin, 2003: xvii):

1. *Posing explicit research questions*
2. *Developing a formal research design*
3. *Assembling a database – independent of any narrative report, interpretations or conclusions – that can be inspected by third parties*
4. *Conducting qualitative or quantitative analysis depending upon the topic and research design*

In addition to these steps I have also

1. Used theory and reviews of previous research to develop a central research question and sub-questions
2. Collected empirical data to address my central research question and sub-questions

By using this framework, I have worked to ensure the quality of my case-study research.

3.3 Data Collection

I chose to use two methods of data collection. Both methods were qualitative. This was appropriate because I was attempting to understand people's experiences, which required I gather in-depth information. I used extensive field observation and in-depth interviews

3.3.1 Observation

Observation methodologies are employed under the assumption that phenomena studied cannot just be deduced, but need empirical observation (Baszanger and Dodier, 1997: 9). This implies that researchers need remain open to new information introduced by the participants and environment. Yin (2003) finds that case-study research "is the method of choice when the phenomenon is not distinguishable from its context" (Yin, 2003: 4). This was true in research; I could not examine the participatory relationship without understanding the context. Therefore, I chose to use observation techniques. By first observing the environment, I was able to better formulate my interview schedule (because I had gleaned considerable information about the research context and dynamic) and I was able to gain entry into a fairly volatile social context with the help of a local community leader. The observation process both laid the foundation for, and supported the data I generated through interviews. It also and informed my analytical thinking.

My research in Blikkiesdorp is described as "in situ", which means that the subject is not meant to be influenced by the study arrangements (Baszanger and Dodier, 1997: 9). My observation research involved spending time in Blikkiesdorp with residents, and spending a day "shadowing" and interviewing a fieldworker. After the visits I took detailed field notes in order to document my observations. I did not use a recorder or take notes while in the field because I did not want to be seen by local people as a reporter or researcher and draw attention to my presence or influence the way people behaved while I was interacting with them.

These observations were *my* account of *my* experiences in Blikkiesdorp and therefore cannot be objective (Baszanger and Dodier, 1997: 15). In order to address any biases I might have had constantly reflected on in my research process; in every observation entry in my field notes, I wrote about the impact of the event had on me and tried to take that

impact into account when writing my thesis to avoid me personal biases as much as possible.

I gained entry into the community by becoming involved in an intervention called the 'bread for life campaign' and initiating a clothing drive. Thereafter I began to email NGOs and individuals to attempt to get NGOs involved in the area. While this process was partly to gain legitimate access into Blikkiesdorp, I have found myself taking a genuine interest in the development challenges facing the people of Blikkiesdorp, and will continue to engage in these ways with the community regardless of the fact that I have now gained entry into the community. I have made a reliable contact in the community through this process. I also found that my legitimacy was largely based on my role as an "active" outsider (Baker: 2006). Active outsiders are observers who become involved with insider's central activities, but don't fully commit to the values and goals of insiders (Baker, 2006: 177). During the period of research a researcher may develop personal relationships with "subjects" such as becoming friends (Baker, 2006: 177). While I have made friends with at least one community leader from Blikkiesdorp, I was very aware of how exploitative this relationship could be in terms of soliciting private information. As such, I was careful not to use any information which identities, harms, or infringes on someone's privacy.

3.3.2 Interview Style

I am chose to employ a semi-structured interviewing style. I found that this was in line with my aim to convey personal understandings and perceptions of participation. I used an interview schedule, which guided respondents to share their own experiences and perceptions. However, I amended the interview schedule as I went along because new insights and analysis shaped my understanding of the topics. As my understanding evolved, I refined my interview schedule.

I remained reflexive throughout my interviews by comparing interviews and coming up with general themes to understand how I should engage with future respondents. This process was challenging because I had to re-interview a number respondents near the end of my data collection. Incorporating reflexivity into my research directed me to think about the quality of the data I was generating (Gibson and Brown, 2009: 92) and drew attention to my own assumptions and stance as 'the researcher' (Hammersly: 2000). It

created the opportunity to adjust the data collection process in the quest for valid information.

3.3.3 Sample and sampling procedure

From each stakeholder group I aimed to gain an understanding of their perceptions of public participation both as a concept and as an activity. A sample size of 12 is insufficient to draw definitive conclusions about all the stakeholders in the participatory process. With a qualitative research design I was primarily interested in soliciting what anthropologists call “rich, thick” information from a cross-section of respondents drawn from the various stakeholder groups targeted in this exploratory study and listed below. I attempted to involve an equal number of respondents from each of the stakeholder groups, but in some cases fewer were available and due to time constraints I had to settle for less than what I would have liked. At the end of the data collection process the following participated in the study:

- five community leaders
- three state managers from the City of Cape Town
- four service providers to facilitate the public participation process.

I now turn to a brief discussion of the rationale and procedure I followed in obtaining the participants.

For each of the stakeholder groups I used a snowball sampling method, which entailed asking people to suggest other participants for inclusion. I found this system was effective because the referrals increased the likelihood of obtaining respondents who were sufficiently interested and knowledgeable to participate.

One stakeholder group included community leaders from Blikkiesdorp. Blikkiesdorp itself is a complex and diverse community. There are 22 different community leader groups serving equally diverse purposes, each containing more than three people. I included community leaders based on an initial observation in Blikkiesdorp which lead me to believe that the community leaders had more contact with officials from the City of Cape Town than other residents. With some effort I managed to obtain interviews with five community leaders: three from one community leadership group, and two from another

In the service provider sample I was able to include four respondents who all worked in the housing department at the City of Cape Town. I chose respondents within one department because I felt that this would allow me to gain a focused perspective from a single service provider group working in Blikkiesdorp. These officials worked in the Housing department at The City of Cape Town. In this sample, I managed to access different levels of seniority, from the field workers to managerial levels.

The state managers group included a sample of three respondents. The people in this stakeholder group were all extremely busy, and I was fortunate to get them to participate. I was able to interview two people from the Public Participation Unit at the City of Cape Town, and one member of the Integrated Development Planning Unit. The respondents were very knowledgeable about the public participation process and they provided me with much in-depth information.

3.3.4 Documentary resources

My data did not only include observations and interviews, but the analysis of documents as well. These documents included: minutes of meetings between The City of Cape Town and communities (Partnership Projects Meeting (3 August 2011), Eastern /Tygerberg Region Partnership Projects Meeting (1 September 2011) and Tygerberg /Eastern Region Partnership Projects Meeting (08 June 2011)) and policy documents (Batho Pele principles (1997) and Handbook (2009), White Paper on local government (1998) and National Policy Framework on Public Participaiton (2007)). Information from these documents supplemented and supported data I gathered through the interviews and observations. The minutes of three different public participation meetings provided valuable insights into relations between those that took part in the meetings and the commitment to participation of the City of Cape Town housing Department. The policy documents also provided me with insight into The City's stance of public participation.

3.4 Data Analysis

I reviewed my data to look for prominent themes. These themes related to: concept, action, potential and context of participation. The 'concept' theme included all data referring to the conceptual understanding of participation. The 'processes' theme included subthemes pertaining to encouragement of public participation, mechanisms of

participation and the Public Participation Unit Meeting. The 'potential' theme included perceptions of potential of public participation and barriers to public participation. I analysed data across these themes to rank each group's understanding and experience of public participation on Arnstein's (1969) ladder. The underlying concept of constant comparison (La Rossa: 2005) supported my aim to understand the disjunctions between stakeholder perceptions of participation. By finding disjunctions and similarities amongst perceptions and experiences of the same phenomenon, I drew up a discussion about how the ambiguity of participation is problematic for operationalising genuine forms of public participation.

3.5 Self evaluation

3.5.1 Value of the study

This thesis is relevant in that it looks at effects of using development language in ill defined ways. Specifically it looks at how the participatory relationship prescribed by national policy and adopted by local governance is experienced by service deliverers, community members and local government. I feel this empirical research has much to offer our understanding and operationlisation of public participation in the real world. This study adds to the empirical knowledge of public participation by analysing the conceptual understanding of public participation. This study shows that negative effects of public participation (such mistrust or resentment) may be caused by the ambiguity of the process rather than the apathy of agents.

3.5.2 Critique of Methodology

I chose to use interviews and observation techniques to gather information. I employed semi-structured interviews. This was useful in that it allowed to capture personal experiences and perceptions, however sometimes, respondents would discuss things that were not relevant to this study. I also chose a reflexive style of study, and after reviewing my interviews and adjusting my topic, I realised I would have to re-interview a number of respondents in order to get pertinent data. This served the study well in that re-visiting respondents allowed me to fill gaps that revealed themselves in my data, and allowed me to gain in depth information on phenomena or ideas I didn't initially expect. The negative

aspect was it made data collection more time-consuming, and slightly risky because I had no assurance that respondents would be willing to engage with me for a second time.

My choice of observation techniques served me well in various ways. The practice gave me background data to substantiate interviews, and informed the questions I asked during interviews. Observation also provided me with legitimacy as a researcher, because community members had seen me around (with my community contact) months before I began to interview community leaders. This gave me credibility to conduct research in the area. The cost of this process was that it was time-consuming, and I only started to conduct interviews after 3 months of observation practice.

My observation was mainly done with the community, and in retrospect I would have spent more time with Service Providers as well. I did make some effort to perform observation on Service providers; I spent a day driving around with the service providers while they went about their normal work day and I was able to observe their service provision while I was observing in the area. I also visited The City office in Kuilsriver and Cape Town, however most of my time was spent in the company of community leaders

3.5.3 Critique of interview schedule

My interviews were organised as semi-structured, and my interview schedule was used flexibly. This was valuable in that it allowed me to engage with topics or information I might not have been able to cover with a rigid schedule. However, it was challenging in some interviews to keep respondents on the topic; and in some cases interviews took up more time. The schedule was an appropriate length; the average interview took under an hour to complete. I was forced to re-interview some respondents as found new information, but all the interviewees were willing to undergo another interview.

My final interview schedule yielded enough data for me to write a detailed findings chapter. This data addresses major themes relating to my central research question. In my proposal document, I set out major themes and linked them to sub themes and interview schedules:

Central Research Question:

What are the disjunctions between people-centred public service provision and the experience of public service delivery?

Major Themes Sub-Themes Interview Schedule

Conceptual understanding of public participation	How is participation understood? What is expected from participation?	1, 2, 3
Perception of Processes of public participation	How is the participatory relationship characterised? Are parties satisfied by the process of public participation? Is the public participation process meeting their conceptual understanding? How did key stakeholder groups experience the Public Participation Unit meeting?	1, 2, 3
Perception of Potential for public participation	What do people think the potential for future partnership is? What has the relationship public participation achieved? How does “the invited space” concept	1, 2, 3

	emerge in key stakeholder groups and how does it impact public participation?	
--	---	--

This process allowed me to formulate clear goals for interviews. I tried to keep questions as simple and direct as possible, and focused on respondent's perceptions of public participation:

Conceptual understanding:

What does participation mean to you?

What do you expect to come from public participation?

The interview schedule solicited generally direct clear answers, and provided relevant data for my thesis.

(full interview schedule page 102)

3.5.4 Adherence to ethical guidelines

My ethical guidelines stipulated that I aimed not to exploit respondents for information, to inform all respondents about what the study was for and how information would be used and to ensure anonymity of respondent identities. In order to adhere to this, I created a form indicating that during interviews I am not allowed to refer to respondents by name, and that this study is for the purposes of generating a university study so that people understand I am conducting research for UCT during the interview. Respondents were informed that they could stop the interview at any time and ask that the interview information be destroyed (as set out in my form). (See Appendix: 102) In cases where I did not have forms available for some reason, or assumed respondents were not comfortable with the written form, I expressed this contract verbally and have these verbal contracts on record.

I aimed to give a fair, unbiased view of the participation process, and undertake thorough research of this topic. In order to give back to the community and The City of Cape Town, I

will give a copy of this thesis to the community leader and a City Official. I hope that this will serve to point out some of the challenges to participation. During my research I entered the community through the bread for life campaign, and initiated a clothing drive throughout the year.

3.5.6 Limitations of the study

The biggest limitation to this study is the small sample of respondents. While a sample of 12 respondents was suitable for the purposes of fulfilling minor dissertation requirements, a larger sample would give more credibility and scope to the study. I had to apply a strict time limit to this study, because my methodology required I re-interview respondents when I found gaps in information. The methodology I employed was time-consuming; however it proved worthwhile in this study. One of the limitations I faced was time-management. I had to keep strict deadlines for data collection in place so that I would have enough time to analyse data and write up my research. I conducted my research in a volatile area, which places limitations on my observation periods; I would only observe in the company of my community contact, and had to work on their schedule while observing. The volatility of the area also limiting because there were areas of Blikkiesdorp I could not visit because it may have been unsafe, which restricted the diversity of my sample.

CHAPTER 4: FINDINGS

In this chapter I present the findings of my research. I first present an analysis of key government policy documents which reflect the state's view of public participation. These documents include relevant sections contained in the White Paper on Local Government (1998), The Batho Pele Handbook (2009) and the National Policy Framework for Public Participation (2007). Thereafter I present key stakeholder groups' perceptions of public participation which includes their conceptual understanding, perceptions and expectations of public participation. Within this chapter I articulate the convergences and disjunctions between the state's policy and key stakeholder groups.

4.1 Analysis of the state's public participation policy

The ANC government has stated in numerous policy and policy related documents (including the above-mentioned ones) that public participation is central in the relationship between the state and the beneficiaries of its service delivery programmes. In this section I use Arnstein (1969) to analyse three key documents in order to distil from them the state's understanding of public participation, and how it should be implemented by civil servants. The three documents are: i.) The White Paper on Local government (1998) (especially the term 'community orientation') ii.) The Batho Pele Handbook (2009) and iii.) the National Framework on Public Participation (2007). I then draw some conclusions about the state's understanding of public participation.

4.1.1 White Paper on Local Government

The White Paper on local government (1998) states that municipalities are required to adopt a "Community Orientation"

...to inform a user-friendly, relevant and quality service to local communities. Municipalities need to develop mechanisms to interact with community groups to identify service needs and priorities as well as community resources that can be unlocked and channelled for development ends. Municipalities will need to develop mechanisms to ensure that their delivery systems are inclusive, and accommodate groups which tend to be marginalised or disadvantaged. Front-line workers who interact with communities on a daily basis will need to be

capacitated to correctly assess, rapidly communicate and effectively respond to service needs. (White Paper on Local Government, 1998: 80)

In this document a “community orientation” means that the municipalities are expected to **interact** with communities – especially the marginalised ones– in ways that are **inclusive** and **accommodating** in order to identify their needs, which will **inform** the delivery of user-friendly and **relevant** state services. It is clear from this paragraph that interaction, inclusion and accommodation of communities is limited to participatory processes that allow the state to gather information which will help them design relevant and user-friendly municipal services.

What Arnstein (1969) calls “consultation” seems to best describe this form of participation. This implies that communities have little or no decision-making power in this process. Public participation without power redistribution is ultimately a frustrating process for community members (as will be demonstrated later in my findings). Such a process may allow state officials, as the holders of power in the development process, to decide on a course of action for communities while claiming that the beneficiaries were involved in the decision-making process. Furthermore, the document sets out the goals for municipalities, but the role of communities in service delivery processes is not spelt out. Nothing is said about how community members could be empowered or capacitated to influence their own development. Public participation as described in this document could not lead to what Arnstein calls “citizen control” because there are no mechanisms for power redistribution.

4.1.2 Batho Pele Handbook (2009)

In the Batho Pele Handbook, the mission of public service delivery is described as “ the creation of people-centred and people-driven public service that is characterised by equity, quality, timeousness and a strong code of ethics” (Batho Pele handbook: 5, 2009). The implication of “people-driven” in people-centred development rhetoric is that citizens will have some kind of power to change the outcome or the direction of service delivery; that services will at least be substantially informed by citizens themselves. This concept of empowerment is also encouraged when the document discusses constitutional principles that should guide service delivery; the fifth point is that “people’s needs need to be

responded to, and the public must be encouraged to participate in policy-making” (Batho Pele Handbook, 2009: 6). Besides the implication that a measure of decision-making power will be vested in the public, the public is allocated a “watch-dog” role when policy repeatedly emphasises that the public should hold service providers accountable for their service delivery; “[Batho Pele] allows customers to hold public servants accountable for the type of services they deliver” (Batho Pele Handbook, 2009: 8).

The document uses language that encourages the idea that services delivery will extend beyond traditional delivery to meet individual’s needs, when it prescribes that Batho Pele is based on the notion of “putting people first” (Batho Pele Handbook, 2009: 8), and when it states that “Batho Pele is the soul of the public service... that will help us rise above the legacies of the past” (Batho Pele, 2009: 9). This service delivery policy takes a stance against poverty and underdevelopment, and creates the expectation that the public will be working alongside public service officials towards a shared goals of social development. The language expressed creates the expectation of what Arnstein (1969) describes as partnership, in which decision-making power and responsibilities are shared (between the public and service delivery officials) as partners work towards shared goals.

The Batho Pele principles (2009) establish a commitment to people-driven ideas through a series of principles. People-centred services are meant to be achieved through the following eight Batho Pele principles, which are discussed in the Batho Pele handbook (2009: 10):

- **Consultation** (citizens should be consulted about service delivery)
- **Service Standards** (citizens should be informed of service standards)
- **Access** (municipalities should work towards giving access to public services to previously disadvantaged groups)
- **Courtesy** (services should be delivered with courtesy and respect)
- **Information** (citizens should be kept informed about service delivery)
- **Openness and Transparency** (municipalities should be run in a transparent fashion)
- **Redress** (if the promised service standard is not delivered, citizens should be offered an apology and a full explanation)
- **Value for Money** (services should provide the best value for money possible)

Batho Pele works to establish a code of conduct within public services that should deliver people-driven services. The principles locate citizens as informed customers who should be informed about services so that they can ensure they receive efficient service delivery, but they are not considered as decision makers. Principles are informed to the end that citizens should be aware customers, not decision-makers; “the whole notion of Batho Pele and each of the eight principles reinforces and encourages the perception of end-users of public services as customers, rather than simply citizens” (Batho Pele Handbook, 2009: 26).

The Batho Pele policy implies that consultation will be the main force in transforming services into “people-driven” processes. Consultation is set out as

a two-way process whereby customers are invited to share their views on their needs and expectations regarding a particular department’s services. These perceptions are discussed and taken into account in planning service delivery (Batho Pele handbook, 2009: 127).

Consultation is characterised as a learning opportunity through which service providers are able to learn about their customers’ needs and expectations, and the limitations of their institutions (Batho Pele handbook, 2009: 127). It does not address the idea that consultation should empower citizens, nor does it aim to redistribute power between citizens and local government at all.

Batho Pele (2009) prescribes public participation as what Arnstein (1969) understands as partnership on a conceptual level through the people-centred language it uses, however the mechanisms it proposes to aim to establish public participation as what Arnstein (1969) understands as consultation. There is no evidence of references to higher levels of participation. For example, while the document encourages citizens to voice their opinions, there is no guarantee that these opinions will be taken into account. Citizens are never given any decision-making power over service provision. There is no reference to a redistribution of power so that citizens have more influence on decision-making. In Arnstein’s terms there is no evidence of “placation”, “partnership” or “citizen control” in the public participation processes. This divergence *within* the document is problematic, because mechanisms are delivering a level of public participation below the conceptual level.

4.1.3 National Policy Framework for Public Participation (2007)

The National Policy Framework for Public Participation (NPFPP) defines and explains public participation as understood by the state. The NPFPP differs from the White Paper on Local government (1998) and the Batho Pele Handbook (2009) in that it defines public participation more clearly. Participation is defined as: “an open, accountable process through which individuals and groups within selected communities can exchange views and influence decision-making” (NPFPP, 2007: 15). It sets out the commitment of the state to “a form of participation which is genuinely empowering, and not token consultation or manipulation” (NPFPP, 2007: 6).

The NPFPP explicitly uses the language of people-centred theory in the manner in which it envisages its methods of social development and service delivery - for example it states:

*Government does not only view community participation as an end in itself.
Rather the purpose of participation is the very essence of a people-centred
approach to development*

(NPFPP, 2007: 7).

The document also sets out key legislation and policy to support this goal:

*This framework policy document draws not only on enabling legislation
but a succession of prior policy work beginning with the White Paper on
Local Government of 1998, the Batho Pele Principles of 1998,
Community-Based Planning principles and the Community Development
Worker initiative of 2003.*

(NPFPP, 2007: 9)

This document recognises the idea that public participation should empower the public. In the NPFPP (2007), Arnstein’s ladder (1969) is actually discussed to explain that there are different levels of participation, however the state claims in the document that “Depending on the objectives around public participation, the approach favoured will differ.” (NPFPP, 2007: 16). This interpretation of Arnstein’s model departs from how she meant it to be used. Arnstein (1969) describes her ladder as a progressive ranking system

that defines the *relationship* between the government and citizens. This is demonstrated in how she describes rungs as “steps” which could potentially lead to citizen control. In the NPFPP (2007) the state draws on Arnstein’s ladder in a way that avoids power sharing. The rhetoric of empowerment of communities is used, but public participation is weakened by the absence of any opportunity for redistribution of power in the relationship between the state and marginalised communities.

The Public Participation Unit, the Integrated Development Planning Unit and the Ward Councillors are all named as key state role players in public participation and the NPFPP (2007) focuses on their role. While there are repeated references to “the community”, there are no explicit policy guidelines to include community leadership (other than ward councillors) in public participation processes. The NPFPP (2007) does not spell out clear mechanisms for public participation, however it uses people-centred rhetoric to describe public participation conceptually. The use of the language of public participation could potentially create false expectations among marginalised communities of high levels of public participation such as partnership, or citizen control, which are not intended by the state.

The NPFPP amounts to placation on Arnstein’s ladder (1969). While there is reference to the idea that communities must be able to voice views and influence decisions, there is no guarantee that these opinions will be taken into account. The inclusion of ward councillors and sub councils (NPFPP: 2007) points towards integrating forms of placation (Arnstein: 1969), which would make this document could potentially lead to a higher level of public participation, like partnership (where power is actually redistributed) (Arnstein: 1969).

National policy encourages public servants to gain information, collect suggestions and solicit opinions from citizens, however there is no assurance that any of these will be taken into account when decisions are made. National policy combines informing and consultation (Arnstein, 1969). Arnstein (1969) asserts that this could be a first step towards genuine forms of participation, because the effort to combine placation with informing represents a genuine effort to include an informed public (Arnstein: 1969).

All of the national policies leave the establishment of mechanisms for public participation up to municipalities. There are no guidelines for, or definitions of mechanisms. While

Batho Pele Handbook (2009) and the National Framework of Public Participation (2007) set out conceptual definitions and goals, neither policy defines mechanisms that could be used to reach those goals. Too much responsibility is placed on Municipal Managers and service providers to choose levels of public participation and execute processes to establish those levels. Managers and service providers (understandably) employ easier (ie lower) forms of public participation. This is problematic because policy documents use people-centred language which implies that public participation could be operating on levels. This could potentially create high levels of expectations (like partnership), and allow for lower levels of public service delivery (like consultation) which inevitably leads to tensions between key stakeholder groups who are involved with public participation processes.

4.2 Municipal Managers' Perspective of Public Participation

4.2.1 Municipal Managers' understanding of the concept

From the perspective of state managers, public participation is primarily about both informing and consulting community members in order to solicit information for them to make informed decisions linked to service delivery. Both of these levels were considered forms of public participation on Arnstein's ladder (1969). One manager said that participation specifically requires communities to voice their opinions and so as to get "a response" from local governance (Interview with Municipal Manager 1: 2011). Another respondent highlighted the fact that feedback on how information is being used is important: "If we get input [from community members], we need to have feedback [from them] about how we are using that input." (Interview with Municipal Manager 3, 2011).

None of the managers thought that shared decision-making was a necessary part of public participation.

At the end [of the dialogue], we still retain the right...we will look at it. And our councillors, because they are our local elected, they will say: 'You know what, we've heard you, but you know what, we disagree. We're going to continue with the way we are doing things'. (Interview with Municipal Manager 1) The municipal managers seem to recognise that there are different understandings or levels of participation, however, public participation is limited by them to information sharing and consultation.

Public participation is either sharing information, or consulting as well. We've also got facebook, we've got twitter, we use bulk smses, we have our bulk normal meetings, we have hearings, there are various tools. (Interview with Municipal Manager 3, 2011).

The adopted level of participation is understood mainly in terms of what information the government needs in order to make relevant and informed decisions:

[Participation] entitles or allows us to partner and speak to our communities in terms of how we envisage plans, but it doesn't collide with the government. We have councillors... they [as community members] are certainly key informants in helping us to arrive at our decisions (Municipal Manager 2: 2011).

The main purpose of dialogue between the state and communities is to help the state make decisions which are informed by community views.

I think the purpose was to create a platform where the city and the community were talking to one another. That's the most important thing. From there, it is to take those results to leadership. (Interview with Municipal Manager 3: 2011)

4.2.2 Municipal Managers' view of the state's implementation of public participation

Public participation is encouraged by the state

There was consensus among the respondents that public participation between local government and community members is actively encouraged. One manager stated that community leaders were especially encouraged to participate with local government because "it's better to deal with a small group of people. With all the information we receive from the community comes a group of priorities" (Interview with Municipal Manager 1, 2011). Another explained that public participation is encouraged so that citizens can air grievances. "They need to tell us what their needs are, so that we can maybe come up with higher level ideas." (Interview with Municipal Manager 3: 2011)

The Municipal Managers thought that community leaders were taken seriously in the participation process.

Most definitely. Just because [service delivery] time frames are not as fast as people would expect, it doesn't mean that their needs are not prioritised (Interview with Municipal Manager 3: 2011).

Municipal manager 1 elaborated:

If you are duly elected by an organisation, we have to take you seriously. And we do take you seriously.

He further pointed out that public participation is institutionalised by official state monitoring processes.

We are monitored. The inputs we receive filter through to our departments. We are actually audited on this [public participation] (Interview with Municipal Manager 1, 2011).

Mechanism for public participation

Ward forums are formally the state's mechanism for public participation by communities.

"The ward forum is at ground level for the people to ensure that their needs are met"

(Interview with Municipal Manager 3, 2011). While state officials use this mechanism they acknowledge that it is flawed, and there is a genuine effort to confront these challenges.

There's been a study done. I think there was only a 65% effectiveness - as judged by the communities. There are those [officials] who are absolutely involved with the community, but there is that percentage that they do it for themselves. The other thing is, I think 70% of the councillors are brand new. So it takes at least a year or a year and a half to capacitate ward councillors to understand what their role is, and what mechanisms are actually available for them. Now we have done some induction programs with them, and the idea is going forward, and we have done that previously with the previous set of councillors. We have specialised workshops with them. Because, if they don't understand how the council program works, they can't be of assistance to the community. And that's a community's key input into the city council. It is through their ward councillor (Interview with Municipal Manager 1: 2011).

Another Municipal Manager also described the ward councillors as key in the ward system:

Researcher: What mechanisms are in place to encourage that [public participation]?

Respondent: OK. The city of Cape Town is huge, so it's broken down into 24 sub councils. And in each sub council there are about 4 or 5 wards. We've got ward councillors. Now each ward councillor would also have ward forums as well.

(Interview with Municipal Manager 3: 2011)

While there has been an effort to capacitate ward councillors, the managers place too much emphasis on ward councillors as the only avenue for effective public participation. In my research with Municipal Managers and service providers I found that ward councillors have not been active at all in Blikkiesdorp.

Public participation is also perceived by the Municipal Managers as the distribution of information using various channels. The municipality is making a substantial effort to implement public participation as what Arnstein (1969) understands as informing. The municipality goes about informing and communicating with communities by:

[a] whole range of interventions, public meetings across the city, accompanied by letters in envelopes in the electricity accounts, reminding them, accompanied by facebook and sms; it's a multi-pronged attack (Interview with Municipal Manager 2, 2011).

Public participation also includes promoting dialogue between the community and the municipality, and capacitating ward councillors in their expected roles. Dialogue is promoted through the initiation of public meetings and ward councillors are capacitated through workshops and training. Municipal managers expect input from community members on issues, and don't aim to only inform them: "There's times when we just inform them, but there's also times when we consult them and we need their input as well." (Municipal Manager 3: 2011). This points to a form of public participation that is best described as consultation. According to Arnstein (1969: 221) consultation can be the first step towards legitimate forms of public participation Consultation as understood and

implemented by managers could lead to higher forms of participation. However, the following for the following reasons I do not think state officials are able to facilitate forms of public participation that exceed placation:

- i.) The highest form of public participation articulated in state policy is what Arnstein calls placation, and managers are unlikely to implement public participation above that level articulated in national policy
- ii.) Capacitating is limited to ward councillors and therefore only a small number of co-opted community members can influence decision-making on behalf of the community
- iii.) The managers have clearly indicated that decision-making power should not be redistributed in public participation processes. “[public participation] is about having a continuous dialogue with the communities we serve... but it doesn’t collide with the government; we have governors” (Municipal Manager 1: 2011) Any kind of public participation beyond placation would demand power redistribution through negotiation (Arnstein: 1969).

Example of Public Participation Unit’s meeting with the Blikkiesdorp Community

The City of Cape Town’s Public Participation unit (PPU) hosted an interdepartmental meeting in response to community grievances about poor service delivery. The meeting included service providers, a PPU member (who acted as chair) and community members. The PPU avoided only including institutionalised role players. The cross-section of community members who participated in the meeting showed an effort by the city to include wide representation from the community.

We had block leaders, and...we’ve got our staff working in the area as well, and we asked the guy who does monitoring and evaluation with the Health Department (because he also works with the people), we also took his list so we can ensure we not just going to one group and then tomorrow then we going to hear that we didn’t speak to the other group. We asked [the City of Cape Town Department of] Housing to provide people [from the community] that they know and work with. We’ve also asked the NGO MyLife that’s been working in Blikkiesdorp to give us a list, and we asked [the Department of] Health to give

us a list as well and then we combined them and invited all . (Interview with municipal manager 3: 2011)

Municipal Manager 3, who chaired the meeting, thought that one of the state's goals of the meeting were to communicate that the City of Cape Town had exceeded the level of service delivery required by national policy on emergency housing:

The city has service delivery mechanisms in place in Blikkiesdorp, there are toilets, there are taps, there are structures, you know what I'm saying? There're two clinics in Delft. So we needed to establish ... Look according to international and national standards you need to have five families for one toilet, and we've got four families for every one toilet. So we needed to establish the city's side of the story (Interview with Municipal Manager 3, 2011).

Another goal of the meeting was to allow community members to express grievances with service delivery.

There are areas [of service delivery] that are not exactly sufficient for the community (in their experience) and that also needed to be highlighted. So where they would say 'Yes, you have over exceeded the international standard, which is four families per toilet. But, because you don't actually know how many people are living in the area and using those toilets, it's not sufficient'. We need to get that kind of dialogue happening (Interview with Municipal Manager 3, 2011).

The manager felt that his Public Participation Unit should respond to those grievances, but it is unable to because the Unit's staff have a heavy work load.

We'll get to them as soon as we can, its not that we aren't prioritising them, it's just that we have a lot to do" (Interview with Municipal Manager 3, 2011).

From my repeated periods of observation in Blikkiesdorp I found that there is definitely structured community leadership (Field notes: 2011). However, the challenge all key stakeholder groups is that community leadership is fragmented. The PPU attempted to

address this challenge by including a range of individuals from the community. Using Arnstein's criteria this meeting can be classified as consultation. When this form of public participation is used, Arnstein (1969) warns that people are often considered in numerical terms in that what counts is the number of people who attend a public participation initiative so that state officials can numerically demonstrate that they are fulfilling policy requirements rather than genuinely engaging with citizens. In my research I found that the managers measured the quality of public participation by the quality of *dialogue* constructed, rather than the number of people who attended their meetings. This suggests that the form of public participation as understood and implemented by managers has the potential to move beyond consultation; although for reasons given earlier it is not likely to achieve the level of partnership or citizen control.

4.2.4 Municipal Managers' perspective of the potential of public participation

Expectations of public participation

Public participation from the managers' perspective seems to be twofold:

[Public participation is] aimed at getting our communities to understand what we trying to do and assist us in coming to the best possible decision, if you understand what I'm saying, at its most brutal and basic level.(Interview with Municipal Manager 2: 2011)

When asked why public participation is pursued, one respondent replied:

Obviously we have to comply with legislation. We have to be democratic, that's a factor... the other step is to help people become aware of the processes of council, so that people understand, when they request something, it's not a matter of 'I want this', and in 2 months time you can actually get something. There is quite a technical procedure for the interaction... So that's also one of the tasks that this department takes very seriously: people need to understand what the process is when a request comes through (Interview Municipal Manager 1: 2011).

Municipal Manager 2 (2011) commented on the potential for partnership or a deeper level of participation between the City of Cape Town and the public:

I think partnership is a very different concept to community participation. I mean, partnership suggests to me a formalised structure.

However, another Municipal Manager 1 felt that there was definitely potential for partnership:

I definitely believe so.

These differing views point out that there may be some inconsistency in the conceptual understanding of public participation in the municipal manager group of City of Cape Town. This is clearly problematic because the directive for public participation begins with them. I don't think that these contrasting views demonstrate any contention within The City of Cape Town managers, but rather demonstrate how the ambiguous language of public participation can lead to problems when implementing public participation processes.

All the managers agreed that the biggest barrier to more community participation in decisions about service delivery is the fragmentation in the community, because

you don't then have a cohesive leadership for the area" (Interview with Municipal Manager 1, 2011).

Municipal Manager 3 (2011) felt that the community was active in terms of taking ownership of their rights:

They have a role as citizens, to make their needs known. And they are definitely exercising that right to speak up for themselves.

The managers agreed that participation is being underutilised at present:

It's a function that's hugely underutilised at all levels of government, and we are really trying very hard, and it is about changing mindsets to embed within the city" (Interview with Municipal Manager 2, 2011).

4.3 Municipal Service Providers' Perspective of Public Participation

4.3.1 Service providers' understanding of the concept

Public Participation is understood by service providers in terms of communication and information. The service providers focused on how they could be assisted by the community to make informed decisions, which reflected how they understood and valued public participation. Service providers focused on efficiency in service delivery, and how community members could help them better their efficient delivery of services. They had a business view of public services and public participation reflected in the following statement:

Public participation is to engage with recipients of your product...We hope to get consent or approval for our product or development. (Service Provider 1: 2011).

Service providers also see public participation as an opportunity to solicit feedback from their clients.

The aim at the end of the day....we want the people to be satisfied with the services we delivering. And as I said, we cannot operate on our own, we need our partners to assist us in order to know what is it they actually need from the city, you as a community member, as a tax payer, we need to know from you, how can we better our services (Service Provider 4: 2011).

These parameters inform public participation by identifying citizens as customers who should be satisfied with the services they receive. Service providers expect public participation to help them provide existing services more efficiently, not to alter decisions or decision-making power

We already render services in informal settlements, but to better those services, we need the participation of the community, and therefore the leaders" (Interview with service provider 3: 2011).

Public participation is viewed as valuable to the extent that it can aid service provides:

*We need our stakeholders within the city to assist us to reach our goals”
(Interview with service provider 4: 2011).*

This amounts to a low form of consultation. It is more than merely the state informing communities because information flows in both directions between the state and communities. I consider it a low form of consultation because the form communication between the two parties is very limited to giving and receiving information as opposed to joint decision-making.

The municipal service providers seemed to view public participation as an opportunity to improve the public image of the municipality as a state institution that cares for the needs of its citizens

*I think they also get a sense of...we don't neglect them. Ja, so it is useful.
(Interview with service provider 1: 2011).*

Arnstein (1969: 219) understands this as the lowest form of public participation, where public participation is used as a public relations tool by power-holders. While this is one goal of service providers, it is important to note that service providers also expressed a genuine concern for the community's need for efficient service delivery.

The service providers had a unified perception of what public participation means. They did not express different understandings of the concept of public participation; nor that it could be measured in different ways. Neither did they refer to sharing decision-making power with communities, or working towards such a level of public participation. The service providers understood public participation in terms of information gaining, and the expectations of participation are based around the quality and quantity of information the City is able to gather to provide better services.

4.3.2 Service providers' view of the state's implementation of public participation

Public participation is encouraged by the municipality

All the service providers felt that community members are actively encouraged to participate in dialogue. Service providers referred to the direct, open relationship has been fostered between the community and service providers, and felt that the

approachable demeanour of the municipal service providers encouraged public participation by community members. There was also reference to a partnership between the municipality, and NGOs operating in the Blikkiesdorp community, which aims to foster a coordinated working relationship with the community.

“The Human Settlements Department and part of the Human Settlements directorate... work through NGOs, ISEs (the Informal Settlements Networks) and CORE(The Community Outreach Research Centre). We try and partner with these NGOs in the community. And at this stage it’s a great success. (Interview with service provider 1: 2011)

The danger in this situation is that the NGO ‘voice’ can substitute the ‘voice’ of the community and that state officials can assume that NGOs represent the community. During my field trips in Blikkiesdorp, I observed that there was friction between some NGOs and community leadership groups. Service providers should be careful in conflating the needs of community members with NGO agendas. One service provider pointed out that even though participation is encouraged, some participants aren’t keen to work with the city:

Absolutely, yes. They are encouraged to form partnerships with us, and some of them do. But others don’t want to work with us.” (Interview with service provider 3, 2011)

All the service providers felt that community members were taken seriously in meetings, and reported that meetings with community members were formally constituted with minutes, chairperson and agendas. This was corroborated to some extent by the minutes of meetings which were provided I by The City of Cape Town (Appendix: 94). These minutes reflect meetings held in informal settlements in the Tygerberg/Eastern region. These documents provide some evidence of how meetings are conducted by the municipality with communities. All the service providers said that public meetings with community members and leaders were are useful.

Very useful, yes... Obviously there's things we don't always agree on. But I think generally there's a good working relationship between the city officials and the community (Interview with Service Provider 1: 2011).

The agenda for these meeting provides a space for communities to genuinely air grievances, and a space for the city to respond to those grievances, which formalises the opportunity for dialogue. The minutes of these meetings record serious issues affecting the community, and when the municipality has failed to fulfil promises or address a pertinent issue communities voice dissatisfaction (Appendix: 94). The response and feedback mechanisms in these meetings take the form of high levels of consultation.

Mechanisms for public participation

The service providers made consistent reference to public meetings as the main mechanism for public participation. They also mentioned that community members approach them directly with problems about service provision.

We have an open door policy. People come straight here with their problems and talk to us. We talk directly to the community. (Interview with service provider 4: 2011).

From the service providers' perspective, the mechanisms for public participation give the community ample opportunity to raise concerns. I witnessed the accessibility of a service provider who works in Blikkiesdorp to the community when I was on one of my field trips. I recorded in my field notebook:

The first thing I noticed is that the service provider's field worker is well known and well respected in the community. He was greeted by most of the people we passed, and he seemed to know them. People kept stopping him to relay information about other people or practices or to ask him questions. He was always friendly and courteous with residents, and residents seem to confide in him and are willing to look into things if he asks (Field notes, 12/08/11).

I later made a similar observation at the Kuilsriver Administration Office, which I visited on three occasions. I recorded in my field notes that

I bumped into community leaders from Blikkiesdorp outside of the Kuilsriver office taking a break from a meeting. This shows that the service providers do meet with community leaders, and vouches for the “open door policy” they have described in interviews with me. (Field notes, 7/10/11)

All the service providers that I interviewed reported that they had on numerous occasions personally met with community leaders from Blikkiesdorp. Service providers do not need to rely on ward councillors to represent the community as they engage directly with community leaders.

Ward Councilors

Municipal managers assume that ward councillors are a focal avenue for public participation, and rely on them to be instrumental in public participation processes (as is discussed above). The service providers all reported that ward councillors across Cape Town vary in levels of efficiency and dedication to their communities;

Some [are], very effective, some [are] useless. (Interview with service provider 1: 2011)

Some service providers experienced problems with ward councilors:

With some of them we are experiencing problems. Councillors are politicians, and you’ll find that many times, they actually pursue their own goals. They’ve got hidden agendas. (Interview with service provider 4: 2011)

All the service providers reported that the ward councilor for Blikkiesdorp was very ineffective, and hasn’t been visibly active at all since the local government elections (Interview with service provider 3: 2011). This contradicts the existing assumptions municipal managers have about ward councillors facilitating public participation.

4.3.3 Service Providers’ Perspective of the Potential of Public Participation

All service providers said that public participation is useful, and that there is definitely potential for deeper level public participation in service delivery which they described as “partnering” with community members:

We want to partner with the people in Blikkiesdorp who want to partner with us. (Service Provider 1: 2011).

This statement reveals two serious problems; the first is that the language used by service providers (“partnering”) implies public participation on a much higher level than they plan to operate at. Partnering in terms of Arnstein (1969) implies shared decision-making power, and service providers do not actually want to share that power. The other problem is that service providers seem to only want to work with some members of the community, which questions how valuable this process could be in the future. Partnering with a select few in the community would probably lead to biased consultation that would represent a fraction of the community.

University of Cape Town

4.4 Community leaders' perception of public participation

4.4.1 Community leaders understanding of the concept

The conceptual understanding conveyed by the community leaders was vague in comparison to the other two stakeholder groups. The community leaders emphasised 'togetherness' in the concept of participation. "Participation is 'mos' to be together. To help. To give input into something." (Interview with Community Leader 2: 2011). This respondent was referring to an inclusive process involving service providers, community members and municipal officials. They also made reference to the idea that public participation should empower the community to participate. "It's giving you together strength, its giving you power, its giving you better vision" (Interview with Community Leader 3: 2011). Another community leader said that public participation should "change things" (Interview with Community Leader 2: 2011). This suggests that public participation should lead to social transformation which I later discovered meant setting the agenda and the way in which resources are distributed.

Community leaders expected to be empowered by the process of public participation. There was an expectation that the process of public participation would allow them to play a key role in service provision decision-making. While most of the community members saw their role as partners, Community leader 5 (2011) was not convinced that an equal partnership with state officials would materialise because of the existing power imbalances (this is discussed further below).

From the above we see that the community leaders understand public participation in terms of empowering community members. They value public participation because it has the potential to give them power. They imagine public participation as the "coming together" of local government and the community to form some kind of partnership. When I observed a community leader meeting I noticed that community leaders discussed the need for solidarity and partnerships rather than charity from the state. They also expressed their desire for a partnership which entailed meeting with high level officials (such as the mayor) to discuss relevant issues affecting their constituency. I also noticed that community members made no reference to public participation as informing (as expressed municipal managers) or consulting (expressed by service providers). Community

leaders expected to be able to negotiate decision-making with the municipal authorities, and consider this public participation.

Community leaders expect positive change (in the form of feedback from meetings or infrastructural change) to arise from public participatory processes. They do not find intrinsic value in dialogue or a public participation platform (as was expressed by municipal managers). They expect substantial change in their living conditions. “If I do participate with the officials I need to see a positive outcome [in service delivery].” (Interview with Community Leader 2: 2011) Community leaders also expressed frustration with the constant dialogue and lack of physical change.

We don't need workshops here to teach us how to clean a toilet. They can give us proper toilets (Interview with Community Leader 4, 2011).

Community leaders felt patronised by these kinds of workshops. Arnstein (1969) calls this form of public participation “therapy”. Therapy is the second lowest rung of the public participation ladder in which people are taught to adjust their values and attitudes instead of engaging with root cause of their problems. Arnstein (1969) sees this as a subtle way by the state to divert the attention of marginal communities from real problems – a sentiment echoed by at least one community leader (see community leader 4’s comment above)

4.4.2 Community leaders’ view of the state’s implementation of Public Participation

Perception of state encouraging public participation

Some leaders felt that the municipality has been making a concerted effort recently, while others felt undermined by public participation. Perceptions of encouragement reflect how valued community leaders feel in public participation processes. Community Leader 2 said

Ja, there are some of them [municipality officials], they've got a better understanding now so things are starting to work out now.

Community Leader 1 (2011) was disappointed by meetings, and stated

whenever we have meetings, they always send other people there and not who we need, so we feel like it's not relevant. We want to talk say, to the mayor. They don't send the mayor; they send some representative of the mayor.

Community Leader 5 (2011) felt that the municipality did not value their participation because it is difficult to set up meetings with municipal officials;

We first need to struggle to get a meeting with them

,and feels this is evidence of the fact that The City doesn't really value public participation.

4.4.3 Perception of public participation mechanisms

Most community leaders view the participation process based on meetings (with the exception of Community Leader 3) and in terms of the extent to which they are able to *assert* decision-making power and inform local government. They expect formal meetings with local government to be opportunities to exert this power.

All except one community leader felt undervalued in public participation mechanisms because of pervading power imbalances. There was dissatisfaction expressed about the fact that;

they [city officials] never come to our public meetings, but we have to go to theirs (Community Leader 1: 2011).

Community leaders also expressed frustration with dynamics in formal and public meetings.

Even if it [meetings] happens. The point is, they are ignoring us. We first need to struggle to get a meeting with them (Interview with Community leader 5, 2011).

While on a field trip in Blikkiesdorp, I found that a group of community leaders had structured (the meeting included a chair and an agenda), regular meetings. These meetings demonstrated that there were organic (although factionalised) forms of leadership within Blikkiesdorp,

I found myself sitting in on a community leader meeting. There was a chairperson in the meeting, and other leaders took turns talking. They are very eager to participate, and they are willing to attend workshops and training programs if need be. They are well respected within the community. The downside is that there is a lack of structure within the community leadership. (Fieldnotes, 29/07/11)

Community leaders feel undermined by the state because of the imposition of state terms, processes and power structures within the participatory process. They want their community leadership structure to be valued in public participation processes. Public participation is implemented as a directive from above, coupled with bureaucratic channels (like ward councillors). One respondent reported:

They [state officials] take all the community leaders power away (Interview with community leader 1: 2011).

Public participation processes in this case have not worked in favour of bottom-up inclusion because public participation is driven from the top, down rather than from the bottom, up. This demonstrates Jones' idea (2003) when discusses the fact that community members are brought into pre-existing power structures and programs that structure the engagement. He highlights the fact that community members can potentially feel undermined by the process of public participation, which turns the process into a burden for community members.

Perception of Ward Councillors as a public participation avenue

Ward Councillors are understood by Municipal Managers to be one of the focal avenues of public participation. All of the Community leaders complained that the Ward Councillor has been completely inactive since the election;

Our own councillor he's non-existent. He's invisible. We made a request to him last week in the meeting; "please make yourself visible" (Interview with community leader 4: 2011).

All community leaders agreed that the Ward Councillor fails to provide any kind of link between the community and local government.

Community leaders complained about the fact that they are forced to take over the ward councillors' duties. In this case, the Ward Councillor is clearly not acting as an effective public participation avenue for the community leaders or the service providers, however municipal managers assume the ward councillors are acting as a key link between local government and the community.

Perception of the Public Participation Unit's public meeting

There was generally a negative response to the PPU meeting. Community leaders expected to meet senior municipal managers and were disappointed when this was not the case.

We needed the top structures. We asked for Helen Ziller, the premier, we asked for the mayor Patricia de Lil. And the time we got into the meeting, we saw other faces. How can you solve problems and how can you talk about problem when the top people aren't even there?" (Interview with Community Leader 3: 2011).

Considering the fact that community leaders expected to see high levels of municipal authority, their expectations were probably set around joint decision-making. Respondents complained that there has been no feedback (verbal or written) from the meeting. Without this feedback they didn't consider the meeting valuable because they could not conduct further meetings on specific issues or address the community. Community leaders don't find intrinsic value in dialogue, they find public participation useful in its capacity to change their quality of services. If there isn't an end product (at least in the form of feedback), community leaders find the process of public participation useless.

Some felt that the PPU meeting was demeaning and a waste of their time because there was no attempt to address their concerns about service delivery.

It was like they putting us on hold again, and we have to wait for the next meeting which will only be on the 6th of October! (Interview with community leader 3: 2011)

The Public Participation Unit's meeting left some of the community leaders frustrated and distrustful of municipal officials. There were, however, some positive signs. A few community leaders thought that the dialogue in the meeting was worthwhile because

the things we discussed were good things" (Interview with community leader 2: 2011).

On the whole the community leaders' expectations about feedback and service delivery from the municipality were not met and therefore they saw the meeting as an incomplete public participation process. Consequently, they experienced public participation as a process that undermined their needs even when it included them in public dialogue.

4.4.4 Analysis of Perception of Potential of Public Participation

Perceptions of potential of public participation

There were mixed views from the community leaders I interviewed about the potential of public participation. Some respondents were completely disillusioned with the public participation process facilitated by the municipality.

[Participation has achieved] Nothing, absolutely nothing. If I speak good about them it will be lies (Interview with community leader 3, 2011).

They felt ignored and were frustrated to the point of silence.

"People don't speak up. Some people don't wanna raise their voice, because they say it's a waste of time" (Interview with community leader 5: 2011).

Community leaders' experiences of public participation processes were not meeting their expectations. Their views about public participation and those of the state officials were not aligned (I will discuss this further later). Some other community leaders were less pessimistic about public participation. They felt that there was some evidence of the public participation process improving

Like at this moment, I can see there's progress, there's changes. And there's an understanding and unity is coming in now... In the last three months there's progress.We've got one meeting per month now. Whenever we've got a

complaint now The City tries to give us support. (Interview with community leader 2, 2011).

All except one of the community leaders thought that there was potential for improvement in the level of public participation.

If they [the state officials] give us 100 percent... well more than they giving now, then there can be [a better public participation process] (Interview with community leader 2, 2011).

One community leader (2011) asserted that they didn't want to form a partnership with the municipality.

We don't need a partnership, because they going to eat the cream. We don't want that. We want an understanding." (Interview with community leader 4: 2011).

This respondent ultimately felt that existing power imbalances between the community leaders and the state officials made a genuine partnership impossible. Arnstein (1969:217) observed that that without power redistribution, public participation is an empty process for those without power, which is demonstrated by community leader 4.

Factioning was expressed as a concern within the community as well;

we are building it [unity] now...if we're more and we're stronger then we can take the government on, but at this moment we are...in [different] groups. That's making us weak. (Community Leader 2: 2011).

The community leaders agreed that the factionalism of community leaders and community members is a major obstacle facing public participation. During a field trip I observed that there were divisions among community leadership groups. The leadership as well the Blikkiesdorp settlement camp is organised into different blocks (from block A to block Q), and there is not really a single coherent leadership structure that unities all the blocks.

Some respondents pointed out that there has been progress towards a more inclusive system of decision-making between service delivery officials and community leaders.

So if we put complaints in according to what's happening here then they put their weight in and they help us. They sort it out... there's a change in the servicing now (Interview with community leader 2: 2011).

4.5 Key Disjunctions

4.5.1 Disjunction within policy

There is a discrepancy between national policies that creates an ambiguous national statement of public participation. National policies that are all still in operation refer to levels of consultation (The White Paper on Local governance (1997) and Batho Pele (2009)) and placation (National Policy Framework on public participation (2007)) when discussing public participation. Because these policies are unclear, they leave it to the discretion of Municipal Managers and service providers to choose a level of public participation and mobilise that level using appropriate mechanisms and processes. National policies create a vague national view of public participation, and state officials in this case have chosen to implement consultation (which is a lower level than placation), because it is easier to mobilise. National policy inevitably allows for expectations of placation by the public, while simultaneously allowing municipal managers to implement consultation. This could lead to tensions between the public and local government (as was demonstrated in this case).

4.5.2 Disjunction between perceptions

There is a clear discrepancy between key stakeholder perceptions of public participation. Municipal managers and service providers perceive public participation as consultation, while community leaders perceive it as partnership. Consequently community leaders feel undermined by public participation processes, while state officials feel that they are making adequate progress in implementing public participation as they understand it. The tension lies in the fact that key stakeholder groups understand public participation differently, and consequently have different expectations of the process. When these expectations are not met, they blame other key stakeholder groups rather than examining the process (which is really what is at fault).

4.5.3 Disjunction between language and delivery of public participation

Perspectives reflect a gap between the language of public participation and the level of public participation delivery. In this case, the language being employed in policy hints at levels of partnership or citizen control, but procedurally indicate placation or consultation overall. Delivery takes the form of consultation, which creates a situation where expectations of community leaders being established by national policies. Key stakeholder groups also tend to casually (and ambiguously) use people-centred rhetoric when discussing public participation, which also works to create different expectations between groups (eg community leaders expect levels of partnership but are experiencing levels of consultation). Essentially, the delivery of public participation is on a lower level than the language of public participation suggests.

The unclear language also creates a circumstances whereby stakeholder groups are expressing themselves to one another in a number scenarios (directly, in formal meetings or in public meetings), however they fail to do so adequately because the language is understood in a number of ways. For example, words like “partner” or “partnership” cannot be used casually (as was demonstrated in my findings) because it implies a certain level of public participation. The disjunction between the language and the delivery of public participation is the most important disjunction because it enables vague policy and a diversity of perceptions and expectations of the same process.

CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION

In this chapter I discuss the impact disjunctions have on public participation in the context of people-centered development. This chapter focuses on the ambiguous language of public participation as key to i) disjunctions between stakeholder group perceptions and i) disjunctions between public participation policy and public participation delivery.

5.1 Public Participation

Public participation refers to the concept that 'ordinary' people should be involved in their own development or governance decisions. Theoretically, public participation marks an important move away from western development styles, and encourages 'development from the south' (Brownhill and Parker, 2010: 276). Ideally, development projects and programs should be enriched by the inclusion of community because this bridges experiences and expertise (Gaventa: 1993), and democratic structures should profit from the ideals of inclusion, deliberation and capacity building associated with public participation (Ableson et al: 2003)

Because of the aforementioned benefits, since 1980 constitutional, legal and policy frameworks have been put in place in South Africa by the state to ensure that the public can participate in governance and development policy-making (Theron, Ceaser and Davids, 2007: 1). While Public Participation remains a buzzword in development and governance practice, many academics assert that there is little empirical data to support positive effects of public participation processes (Lizarralde and Massyn: 2008, and Rowe et al: 2008). Major debates surrounding the limitations of public participation in practice point towards the influence of top-down planning or planners (Cooke and Kothari: 2001, Gunder: 2003 and Lowndes and Sullivan: 2004). Ultimately, these authors conclude that commitment to public participation is lacking because of these top-down influences and public participation devolves into some form of manipulation.

Power imbalances are often seen as a major challenge to public participation. While power imbalances exist between experts and communities, public participation cannot act as a transformative force to change local governance, but rather becomes an appeasing process in which communities feel they have participated in local governance (Perrons and

Skyers: 2003 and Cornwall, 2008: 270). In such cases, public participation is often used to maintain the status quo.

While these major debates are valid in many cases, I chose to focus on the perspectives of different key stakeholder groups to understand why public participation was not establishing inclusive social development in a specific case. I found that there was genuine commitment to public participation as it is understood by each key stakeholder group. Based on my case study I found that one of the major limitations of public participation is that it is an ambiguous concept, and that this likely to lead to a discrepancy between expectations and perceptions between key stakeholder groups.

5.2 Ambiguity in Public Participation

The idea that public participation is ambiguous is not new. According to Rowe and Frewer (2004) and Day (1997) the concept public participation is defined in many ways and there is no agreement on a single understanding of the concept among academics or those involved in public participation exercises. Along with Atkinson (1999), I have found in my study that public participation is broadly associated with partnerships, but the definition of what constitutes a partnership is not at all clear or agreed upon.

5.2.1 Disjunctions between stakeholder group perceptions

When it comes to the practice of public participation I found that there is a tendency within stakeholder groups to think that certain forms of public participation, mechanisms and expectations are appropriate. Their perspectives and expectations are informed by how they understand the concept public participation.

My research confirms that stakeholder groups do not share a common understanding and therefore it is not surprising that relations between stakeholders (especially state officials and community leaders) are often strained. They might be using the same words, but the way they imagine public participation is not the same. Often this is one of the major reasons for public participation processes not running smoothly.

State initiated public participation processes in people-centred development are complex because of the power dynamic between main stakeholder groups. Key stakeholder groups tended to blame one another instead of examining the process of public participation

itself. I found that all key stakeholder groups had been making genuine efforts to implement public participation as they understood it, which is in contrast to works like Everatt, Marais and Dube 's (2010) and Botes, Marais and Human (2009). They investigated the impact that participation made on local level government officials, and found that public participation lacked real power, and community participation amounted to tokenism because local level government officials were not seriously concerned with implementing authentic public participation. My research suggests that managers do not intentionally create false participation, rather public participation as they implement (and understand) it is at a lower level than community members expect. This is in contrast to works by King and Cruikshank (2010), Evans (2008) and Dagnino (2005) who find that community participation is often just a means for government to legitimate itself within a community through intentionally giving them a false sense of participation. My analysis points to the idea that the ambiguous language and diverse understandings of public participation are responsible for creating expectations that are not met by the efforts of state officials. The issue of misleading language being used is not just a problem in national policy; state officials refer to high levels of public participation in language, for example "we also formed something like a **partnership** with all the informal settlements community leaders" (Service Provider 2: 2011), however they are actually operating on lower levels of participation (like consultation or placation).

Community leaders understand public participation along the lines of citizen power. When public participation is implemented on a lower level by state officials, they are disappointed by the process. Some community leaders became despondent about the concept of public participation as a result. This reflected the works of Brynard (2009) and Buccus et al (2008) who explain that the public might not participate in projects if they feel their contribution will not make any change, if they feel threatened or if they are uninterested. In my research, many community leaders felt that they were being ignored, and that the process was ultimately a waste of time.

One example of the tensions created by different views of public participation held by stakeholders, who were involved in my research, was the Public Participation Unit meeting. City managers and community leaders participated in the meeting, but they described contrasting experiences of it. The state managers' expectations were met and they felt

they had constructed a representative dialogue. They felt that this would bolster a good working relationship between The City and the community. The Community leaders' expectations were not met. They were very dissatisfied with the meeting because that they had expected feedback which they did not receive. While The City of Cape Town managers thought the meeting involved the community in a participatory way, and they were keen to continue with the PPU initiated meetings, the community leaders felt undermined by the state officials. This example demonstrates how contrasting perceptions of what constitutes public participation influence how stakeholders imagine it happening, which then creates certain expectations for the intervention. If these expectations are not met, tensions are created in the relationship.

Brynard (2009) and Buccus et al (2008) state that the public might not participate in projects if they feel their contribution will not make any change, if they feel threatened or if they are uninterested. I found the same feelings in community leaders expressed by community leaders in Blikkiedorp, however my research went a step further to try and locate where these attitudes came from. I found that community leaders were not totally disregarded by local level officials, but rather that the language of public participation is often inappropriate to support levels of public participation delivery. Consequently, expectations are not met for some stakeholder groups and contrasting perceptions are established.

5.2.2 Disjunctions between public participation policy and public participation delivery

Mubangizi (2007) asserts that governments are informed by adopted development approaches when delivering public services. The development imperative currently informing participation policy is derived from the people-centred paradigm, which prescribes development as “creation of *peoples'* initiative, and based on the resources which *they* controlled” (Korten, 1984:324). Russel and Bvuma (2001) find that the South African government has taken substantial policy steps in order to genuinely reform public service around people-centred needs. The state has taken these steps through using people-centred goals and rhetoric in public participation policy. The language of the people-centred paradigm implies participation as citizen power, by reflecting on the direct control the public should have over resources. People-centred ideology places decision-making power in the public, however this is not the intention of local government.

Examples of people-centred rhetoric is used in national policy documents are terms such as “community empowerment” (NPFPP, 2007: 18), “people-driven” (Batho Pele, 2009: 5) and “[citizens] as partners in resource mobilisation” (White Paper on Local Government, 1998: 9). These terms encourage some stakeholders’ (mainly community leaders) beliefs that public participation outlined in these documents is what Arnstein (1969) calls citizen power or partnership. In practice, state officials find it easier to implement consultation (with the best intentions towards implementing public participation as they understand it) which is the lower level of participation that emerges from state policy documents. Public participation is implemented by the state at a level of consultation or placation. The language of the people-centred paradigm is problematic when applied to public participation implemented by local government because they are more likely to implement public participation on lower levels than is implied by the language that is used. Consequently, community leaders and their constituents feel undermined by state agents and public participation processes. Williams (2008) finds while there is constitutional intent towards community participation, the realities of bureaucratic institutions (with uneven power relations) limit community participation, and effectively reduce it to spectator politics. I disagree; constitutional intent (as demonstrated through national policies) prescribes goals of people-driven service delivery through public participation without prescribing of mechanisms to reach such goals. National policy sets high expectations of the process of public participation without actually describing what that process is, or describing exactly what public participation is. My analysis of policy actually finds that the constitutional intent towards public participation is expressed on too high a level in national policy documents because local government does not intend to redistribute decision-making power towards the public.

Public Policy as a lone element cannot be blamed for the high expectations of public participation processes, however, I do feel that the language used in policy documents play a significant role in perpetuating flawed public participation by describing public participation with language that implies higher levels of public participation than will actually be operationalised by the state.

5.2.3 Summary

My analysis of Public Participation as it is practised by the City of Cape Town municipality draws attention to the technical problem of ambiguous language being used in social development. This research helps us understand that it is one of the contributors to tensions between the community leaders and state officials. People-centred rhetoric is used by state officials in public participation interventions but the practice falls far short of the rhetoric. Community leaders and their constituencies are inclined to understand public participation as citizen power partly because of the people-centred vocabulary adopted by the state and partly because they are somewhat unrealistic about the outcomes of public participation processes.

This research demonstrates that public participation is an ambiguous process, and that public participation could be having detrimental effect on the relationship between the community and local governance by establishing high community expectations that will not be met by the state. Without a unified conceptual understanding of public participation, some stakeholders will be dissatisfied with the process, which creates mistrust, suspicion or resentment. In a broader spectrum, this analysis points out that development is not just about delivery, it's about managing expectations, communication and technical issues.

My analysis of state public participation policy documents and the perceptions of different stakeholders has also shown that they are further disadvantaged – even doomed - by the ambiguity in the states policy documents and the diverse understandings by stakeholders of the term.

CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSION

This study set out to investigate the disjunctions and convergences in the different stakeholders' perceptions of public participation policy for service delivery in Cape Town's Blikkiesdorp, and the consequences for public participation processes in the context of people-centred development. In order to address this question, I asked the following questions; how do different stakeholders perceive and experience public participation? What are the convergences and disjunctions in the stakeholders perceptions of public participation? What are the consequences of disjunctions and convergences for public participation processes in the context of people-centred development?

I used Arnstein's ladder (1969) as the theoretical framework for my research. The model identified a hierarchy of participation levels, which allowed me to demonstrate convergences and disjunctions in stakeholder experiences and disjunctions, and discuss the implications of them. Arnstein's ladder provided me with a good foundation to discuss my findings, however I did discuss the weaknesses of the model in my critique of it in chapter four.

I analysed three national policy documents (The Batho Pele Handbook, The White Paper on Local Government and the National Policy Framework of Public Participaiton) to establish the policy outlook of public participation. I also conducted research with community leaders and service providers, and municipal managers from The City of Cape Town. I used qualitative methodology; incorporating observation practice and interviews so that I could compile in depth information for my dissertation.

My policy discussion pointed out inconsistencies between national policies that could be contributing to the variety of conceptual understanding of public participation, and I linked this to my findings from key stakeholder groups.

In my findings, I found that there were disjunctions between stakeholder groups in terms of their conceptual understanding, use of mechanisms, and experiences of public participation. I found that there was largely convergence of perspectives and experiences within each stakeholder group, with the exception of the community leader group. In this group, respondents had mixed attitudes towards public participation. I found that key

stakeholder groups understand public participation differently, and employ (or expect) appropriate processes to mobilise their understanding of public participation.

6.1 Key Findings

The manager perspective understands public participation as the construction of dialogue between local government and other stakeholders. They understand it as a two way flow of information and value the dialogue itself as the process and outcome of public participation. They felt that the public is encouraged to participate with The City, and assumed that the mechanism for public participation is the Ward Councillors in each community. They also expressed value in public meetings, and find that the practice of public participation establishes good relationships between the community and the city. The manager group finds value in a “continuous dialogue” (Municipal Manger 2: 2011), and uses ward councillors and public meetings as mechanisms to establish this dialogue.

The Manager perspective employs mechanisms that satisfy their conceptual understanding of public participation: managers aim to construct public dialogue, and try to achieve this with public meetings. The value of public participation is viewed in the process itself; they are not really concerned with the infrastructural impacts of public participation, but rather that a dialogue is established between the City of Cape Town Municipality and the community.

Service providers understood public participation as creating an avenue whereby community members could feed relevant information to public service providers. These avenues were created so that public service officials could make the best possible decisions (based on as much relevant information as possible), and so that they could they could bolster the City’s legitimacy in the area to gain as much support as possible for the goals and actions of The City. The mechanisms they listed to achieve this idea of public participation were mostly public meetings and direct forms of public participation.

Most of the community leaders understand public participation as an empowering process that should encourage some kind of partnering between the community and service providers so that services can be bettered. Community leaders generally understand public participation mechanisms as the meetings that happen between service providers and themselves. Their overall perspective is mixed. There was generally dissatisfaction

with power imbalances (ie community leaders felt undermined) because they struggle to secure meetings with The City officials and they felt they were not interacting with high levels of authority in meetings (where they had requested to see people such as the premier and the mayor). The community leaders consequently felt undermined. Participants also complained about the lack of feedback from the PPU meeting. Some community leaders reported the fact that public participation is becoming a better process, and that The City was making a greater effort (by increasing regularity of meetings and becoming more available to them in the past 3 months).

Most community leaders expect an empowering process, because they understand public participation as partnership. They expect direct meetings with high level officials because they understand public participation as partnership. They do not view public participation as an end, they view it as a means to change their environment. Most of the community leaders are frustrated with the process of public participation because it is failing to meet their expectations.

I found three major disjunctions in public participation that adversely affect the process;

- 1) Disjunctions within policy
- 2) Disjunctions between key stakeholder perceptions
- 3) Disjunctions between the language and delivery of public participation

My findings point out that public participation is an ambiguous process because of the people-centred language that is understood in diverse ways by key stakeholder groups. National policy is inconsistent, and leaves the responsibility to municipal managers and service providers to interpret policy and employ mechanisms. Managers usually deliver a lower level of public participation than policy suggests through people-centred rhetoric. While public service officials are satisfied by public participation, community members feel undermined by state officials because public participation is not meeting their expectations. This thesis points out the tensions that arise from this scenario. Key stakeholder groups are using the same rhetoric, but they understand that rhetoric differently. Public participation is seldom an effective process, and this study has demonstrated that one major reason for this is that the ambiguous language used creates unnecessary tensions in an already complex dynamic. Language needs to be more clearly

defined and consistently used in policy and interactions so realistic and fair expectations can be established by all key stakeholder groups.

REFERENCE LIST

Abelson J, Forest P, Eyles J, Smith P, Martin E and Gauvin F, 2003. Deliberations about deliberative methods: issues in the design and evaluation of public participation processes, *Social Science & Medicine*, Volume 57, Issue 2, July 2003, 239–251

Accountability in Public Services in South Africa, World Bank Report, 2011, World Bank Publication

Acharya A, Houtzager P and Gurza L 2004. Civil society representation in the participatory budget and deliberative councils of São Paulo, Brazil, *IDS Bulletin*

Ahmeda S A and Alib SM, 2006. People as partners: Facilitating people's participation in Apartheid South Africa, Durban: Madiba Publishers

Arnstein S, 1969, A ladder of Citizen Participation, *JAIP*, volume 35 number 4

Atkinson R, 1999. Discourses of partnership and empowerment in contemporary British urban regeneration, *Urban Studies*, volume 36 number 1

Batho Pele Handbook, 2009. KZN Education department,
<http://www.kzneducation.gov.za/DocumentsPublications/BathoPeleHandbook.aspx>

Bishop P and Davis G, 2002. Mapping Public Participation in Policy Choices, *Australian Journal of Public Administration*, volume 61 number 1

Bond, P. 2002. *Unsustainable South Africa: environment, development and social protest*. London: Merlin Press.

Bond, P. and J. Dugard (2008) 'The Case of Johannesburg Water: What Really Happened at the Pre-paid "Parish Pump"', *Law, Democracy and Development*, volume 12 number 1

Brownill S and Parker G, 2010. Why Bother with Good Works? The Relevance of Public Participation(s) in Planning in a Post-collaborative Era *Planning Practice & Research*, Vol. 25, No. 3, 275–282

Brynard, DJ 2009. *Public participation in local government and administration: bridging the gap*, UNISA Press

Burger J, 2006. Transform, perform... Or just conform? Evaluating SA public management reform initiatives, Inaugural lecture, School of Public Management and Planning, Stellenbosch University

Cameron R, 2010. Redefining political-administrative relationships in South Africa, *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, volume 76, number 4

Cameron, R 2009. New Public Management Reforms in the South African Public Service: 1999-2008, Paper presented at Political Studies departmental seminar, University of Cape Town

Cooke, B. and Kothari, U., eds. (2001) *Participation: The New Tyranny?*, Zed Books, London.

Corbin J and Strauss A, 1990, *Grounded Theory Research: Procedures, Canons, and Evaluative Criteria*, *Qualitative Sociology*, Volume 13, Number 1

Cornwall A, 2002. 'Making spaces, changing places: situating participation in development', IDS Working Paper No. 170, Institute of Development Studies, University of Sussex

Cornwall, A. (2008) Unpacking 'Participation': models, meanings and practices, *Community Development Journal*, 43 (3), 269 – 283.

Cornwall A, and Gaventa, J, 2000. From users and choosers to makers and shapers: re-positioning participation in social policy, *IDS Bulletin*, Vol 31 No 4

Cornwell A and Coelho V S. 2007, *Spaces for Change? The politics of participation in new democratic arenas*, Zed Books

Cruz I, Stahel A and Max-Neef M, 2009. Towards a systemic development approach: Building on the Human-Scale Development paradigm, *Methods*

Dagnino E, 2005. 'We all have rights... but: contesting concepts of citizenship in Brazil', in N. Kabeer, ed., *Inclusive Citizenship: Meanings and Expressions*, London: Zed Books

Daniels, D, 2002. Using the life-stories of community builders in informal settlements to advance the emancipation and development of women, *Global Research Perspectives* 2

Dauids I, Theron F and Maphunye and K, 2009. Participatory Development in South Africa: A

Development Management Perspective, Second Edition, Van Schaik publishers, Pretoria

Day, D (1997). Participation in the planning process; an essentially contested concept, *Journal of Planning Literature*, volume 11 number 3

Desai, A. 2001. The Poors of Chatsworth: Race, Class and Social Movements in Post-Apartheid South Africa, Madiba Publishers, Durban

Emmett T, 2000. Beyond community participation: Alternative routes to civil engagement and development in South Africa, *Development Southern Africa*, volume 17 number 4

Evans M, 2008. Who is for community Participation? Who is community participation for? Exploring the well-being potential for involvement in regeneration. Education, Knowledge and Economy, volume 2 number 3

Feagin J R, Orum A Mand Sjoberg G 1991. A case for the Case Study, UNC Press

Fiil-Flynn, M. 2001. The Electricity Crisis in Soweto, Occasional Paper Series No. 4, Municipal Services Project: Cape Town

Flyvbjerg B, 2006. Five Misunderstandings About Case-Study Research, *Qualitative Inquiry* Volume 12 Number 2

Fung A, 2003. Survey article: recipes for public spheres: eight institutional design choices and their consequences, *Journal of Philosophy*

Gaventa J, 1993. The powerful, the powerless and the experts: knowledge struggles in an information to age, in P. Park, B. Hall and T. Jackson, eds, *Participatory Research in North America*, Bergin and Hadley, Amherst, MA.

Godfrey L, 2007. Facilitating the improved management of waste in South Africa through a national waste information system, *Waste Management*, Volume 28, Issue

- Gray, D. 2004, Doing Research in the real world, Sage publications, London
- Guijt I And Shah M, 1998. The Myth of Community: Gender Issues in Participatory Development. London: Intermediate Technology Publications.
- Haque, S 2000. Significance of accountability under the new approach to Public Governance, International Review of Administrative sciences, volume 66
- Haque, S, 1998. The Paradox of Bureaucratic Accountability in Developing Nations under a Promarket State, International Political Science Review, volume 19, number 4
- Heleba, 2008. Implications of the lack of community participation in service delivery, ESR Review
- Human F, Marais L and Botes L , 2009. Missing the Boat? Community Participation in the Integrated Development Planning Process in the Free State, South Africa, Journal for Development Support Vol. 1
- Jones P S, 2003. Participation-based Policy? Urban Regeneration's Poisoned Chalice: Is There an Impasse in Community Participation? Urban Studies, volume 40 number 581
- King C and Cruickshank M, 2010. Building capacity to engage: community engagement or government engagement? Community Development Journal
- Korten, D. (1990). Getting to the 21st Century: Voluntary action and the global agenda. Connecticut: Kumarian Press.
- La Rossa,R, 2005. Grounded Theory Methods and Qualitative Family Research , Journal of Marriage and Family, volume 67
- Lizarralde G, Massyn M, 2008. Unexpected negative outcomes of community participation in low-cost housing projects in South Africa , Habitat International 32, 1–14
- Lowndes, V. and Sullivan, H. (2004) Like a horse and carriage or a fish on a bicycle: how well do local partnerships and public participation go together? Local Government Studies, 30 (1), 51 – 73

Matibane L, 2010, Improving service delivery through partnerships between Local Government, Civil Society and the Private Sector: A case study of Imizamo Yethu, Master of Public and Development Management at the Stellenbosch University

Max-Neef, M 1991. Human scale development Conception, application and further reflections, The Apex Press, London

McDonald, D A, 2002. Privatization and the New Ideologies of Service Delivery, Service Delivery and Policy Reforms Since 1996 Municipal Services Project, Occasional paper 7

McLennan, A 2007. Unmasking Delivery: Revealing Politics, Progressive Development Studies, volume 7 number 1

Meth, P 2002. Rethinking the dumping grounds: questioning assumptions about movement into the relocation settlement of Bilanyoni, Area, volume 33, number 3

Mishler in Elliot, J 2005. Using Narrative in Social Research, Sage Publications limited, Lond

Mokgor J, 2000. Provincial Experiences In Managing National Policies On The Transformation Of The Public Service, Journal of Public Administration And Development, volume 20

Mubangizi, BC 2007. Service delivery for community Development: reconciling efficiency and community participation with specific reference to a South African rural village, Journal of Public Administration, Vol 42 no 1 Habitat International 30 (2006) 781–796

National Policy Framework for Public Participation, 2007. Department of Provincial and Local Government

Ncholo and Bardill in Cameron R and Tapscott C, 2000. The Challenges of State Transformation in South Africa, Journal of Public Administration and Development. Vol 20

Ncholo P, 2000, Reforming The Public Service In South Africa: A Policy Framework Public Administration And Development, Journal of Public Administration And Development

Oakley and Marsden (1991) in Davids I, Theron Fand Maphunye and K, 2009. Participatory Development in South Africa: A Development Management Perspective, Second Edition, Van Schaik publishers, Pretoria

Perrons, D. and Skyers, S. (2003) Empowerment through Participation? Conceptual explorations and a case study, *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 27 (2), 265– 285.

Pretty J N, Guijt I, Scoones I and Thompson J, 1995. IIED Participatory Methodology Series No. 1, A Trainers' Guide to Participatory Learning and Action, International Institute for Environment and Development

Rowe G and Frewer L, 2005, A Typology of Public Engagement Mechanisms, *Science Technology Human Values* 2005 30: 251

Rowe G, Horlick-Jones T, Walls J, Poortinga W and Pidgeon N, 2008. Analysis of a normative framework for evaluating public engagement exercises: reliability, validity and limitations, *Public Understanding of Science*, 419–441

Russell E W and Bvuma D G, Alternative service delivery and public service transformation in South Africa, volume 14 number 3

Silverman, D 2000. *Doing qualitative research*, Third Edition, Sage Publications, London

Smith L, 2002, The Corporatization of Water, Service Delivery and Policy Reforms Since 1996, Municipal Services Project, Occasional paper 7, 2002

Stephenson N and Papadopoulos D, 2006. *Analysing Everyday Experience: Social Research and Political Change*, Palgrave Macmillan, New York

Strauss, A. (1987). *Qualitative analysis for social scientists*. New York: Cambridge University Press

Theron F, Ceaser N, Davids I, Participation According to IAP2 Principles: Opportunity or Challenge for Integrated Development Planning in South Africa? *International Journal of Public participation*, volume 1 Issue 1, 2007

Thompson L, 2007. 'Created' and 'Invited' Spaces, Participatory Governance?, Citizens and the State in South Africa, African Centre for Citizenship and Democracy, African Centre for Citizenship and Democracy

White paper on local government: 1998, Habitat International volume 30

White Paper on Transforming Public Service Delivery: 1997

Williams, J.J. 2008. The politics of social change and the transition to democratic governance: Community participation in post-apartheid South Africa, in African politics: Beyond the third wave of democratisation. Cape Town: Juta

Work, R 1999. The role of participation and partnership in decentralised governance: a brief synthesis of policy lessons and recommendations of nine country case studies on service delivery for the poor, UNDP New York

University of Cape Town

APPENDIX

1.1 Interview release form	84
1.2 Transcription of Interview (Respondent 3)	85
1.3 Extract from Observation notes (Community experience)	93
1.4 Extract from Observation notes (Service provider experience)	95
1.5 Minutes from meeting (the City of Cape Town and Community leaders)	97
1.6 Interview Schedule	104

University of Cape Town

1.2 Interview: Municipal Manager 3

RESEARCHER: I'm writing my thesis on public participation, and I'm writing with respect to Blikkiesdorp specifically. Before we start, if you feel uncomfortable at any point during the interview or you want it to stop or you don't want to answer a question, that's fine, just let me know. I also won't be using your name in any documents and I am only using this information for the purposes of my thesis.

RESPONDENT: ok

RESEARCHER: So my first question is, what exactly does the PPU do?

RESPONDENT: Main purpose is the monitoring of public participation by the city of Cape Town. And the reporting thereof. We also evaluate now. When we say monitoring, of course we have mechanisms in place in terms of interdepartmental committees, departments reporting to us on a quarterly basis. We also have an annual calendar in all the planned public participation processes for the next financial year. They give it to us, at least by April for the next financial year. And we use that calendar to help us monitor. And also in terms of not flooding the public with too many public participation processes at once. For example, we are going out with IDP now, which we do now from next month, for the next 2 months. Which means we cannot have too many other processes going on; so we need to make sure we keep that area as clear as possible, you know, for the IDP. So that's how we assist with monitoring. But also in terms of ensuring that departments are doing the best form of public participation that they can do, and not just being compliant by putting an ad in the newspaper and saying we didn't receive any comments. Also sensitising them to the fact that they need to record any form of participation whether it's by recording it audio visual, by having meetings and having attendance registers, minutes, so that they can provide numbers at the end of the day. We need quantitative information from them. And we also need qualitative as well in terms of assessment, we ourselves also do quantitative surveys for each process, we just started that this year. So if there's a by law that has gone out, the public participation cycle has concluded, then we also go into the same community where they have given us a record of comments and a record of people who have commented, we go into the same communities and we do a satisfaction survey in terms of participation as well. So that's the monitoring and evaluation, we also assist with public meetings, where we step in and go and facilitate, especially if various departments need to come together. We go into that kind of thing to ensure various groups come together, and also to ensure the whole public participation cycle is adhered to, to speed up the process at the end of the day. Which I think is something new, we are actually forerunners in terms of public participation

county wide. Also in this unit we also run a domestic council ensuring that there public participation for the young people. We also do the gatherings, which is people apply for permission to have gatherings, even if they go to parliament, they need to apply here by us...all the marches as well ...in a nutshell that's basically what we cover. We also have a by-law schedule, what the policy is, what stats are, what the bylaws are. We even write policies, all public engagement. Also for disciplines like the disability unit, where its over arching..that kind of thing you know. We are the forerunners in terms of that as well...in a nutshell that's it. But we mainly for monitoring and evaluation.

RESEARCHER: What exactly what does that mean to you, "public participation", what does it entail?

RESPONDENT: Public participation, there's various meanings, I mean you've obviously looked at what the studies say, international studies as well. Public participation would be a form of a two way communication between government and citizens. So there's times when we just inform them, but there's also times when we consult them and we need their input as well. In terms of input, if we have input we need to have feedback as well as to how we are using that input is being used. And I think that's where government still has a bit of work. We only getting to that now. We did it with the IDP last year, the review process last year and there was actually a feedback process where we acknowledged people for their comments, and we also have a feedback process where we have a postal card saying that we received the comment, this is how the comment was used.

RESEARCHER: Oh, so you send that to individuals?

RESPONDENT: We've only done that for the IDP, but we will be trying to get into that with other processes as well. Ja, so that is it. Public participation is either sharing information, and consulting as well. Especially with the IDP, and our by laws, the by laws as well we need the input of the public. We've got a community based organization, where community organisations register themselves at our various sub councils, because they want us to communicate with them, and the youth as a tool. We've got various tools that we use. We've got facebook, we've got twitter, we use bulk smses, we have our bulk normal meetings, we have hearings, there's various tools that we use for public participation in terms of the monitoring we also have a tool kit, working with the department who are our clients. For each public participation process they come to us. We do a public participation plan with them, the cycle they need to fill...dates, planning and so on. At the end they are going to post a report aswell and that goes into our reporting. And then once we've received the post report, we do a public participation initiative with the people.

RESEARCHER: Why is public participation encouraged, what is the value in it?

RESPONDENT: We cant make decisions for people. I might not know what the need of a person is in Khayalitsha so I can not speak for them. They need to tell us what their needs are, so we can maybe come with higher level ideas. But the actions need to come from the citizens themselves in the sense of “We need service delivery in this area, and these are the specifics in terms of the service delivery we require, based on our experiences in our community.” We wont know that unless they tell us, and I think that is important for governance. We need to ensure that peoples voices are heard, that they have their say in terms of what their needs are, and its our responsibility to inform them, that ok, we have received your “needs analysis” if I can say it like that, and this is what we can implement, these are the ones that we can prioritise and have programs in, but there are ones that we will not be able to see to. And to have that type of interface.

RESEARCHER: What mechanisms are in place to encourage that?

RESPONDENT: OK. The city of Cape Town is huge, so its broken down into 24 sub councils. It used to be 23 and now we’ve just added in the 24th one. So there’s 24 sub councils all over. And in each sub council there are about 4 or 5 wards. We’ve got ward councillors. Now each ward councillor would also have ward forums as well. On a national level they’re called ward committees, but the City of Cape Town does Ward Forums. So we do the ward forum elections, we assist the ward with the whole process, because we’ve got a data base, we send out a call and ensure that the details that we have are up to date. We ask them then to nominate in view of the election process, then they have a ward committee, ward forum. They have quarterly meetings or whatever, its a minimum of quarterly for the year. So their needs would then be filtered to the ward councillor. The Ward Councillor then sits on the sub council as well. So the Ward Council feeds into the sub-council, and those needs are elevated from there as well. And then Ward Councillors also sit on portfolio Committees as well, and that’s another route where they filter through their needs as well. But the Ward forum is the most ground level, post to the people to ensure their needs are met...

RESEARCHER: So they’re like the link between the government and the community?

RESPONDENT: That’s it, the needs come through there. The Ward Councillor might not take the needs to the portfolio committees, there it might be a bit political. Sometimes, I’m not saying it is like that, but to ensure that the people have avenues, the people can take it to ward committees or sub councils as well. From sub councils it goes into various departments that’s relevant to the meetings. So that is how we go through all our processes. But of course we go broader as well.

RESEARCHER: what do you mean by broader?

RESPONDENT: We still use newspapers, we still go into local newspapers, we still use facebook, we still use twitter, we still send out bulk smses to people. Everybody will report. If its something that's sectoral, something like advertising, you'll have sectoral meetings as well. If you talking people with disabilities, that's a specific sector. If you talking dial a ride, that's only for people with disabilities. So you will only have meetings with them concerning dial a ride. That type of thing, so we do go broader as well. We don't just use those avenues.

RESEARCHER: Ok, so participation isn't just in terms of meetings, its also about how information is distributed?

RESPONDENT: yes

RESEARCHER: Can you tell me about the public participation initiative in Blikkiesdorp?

RESPONDENT: Umm, I mean you've obviously been there, so you've heard about what we've done so far. We've had one community meeting, as an interdepartmental team, we went out and we haven't yet been able to follow up and go back, because its just a very busy and sensitive right now, but we will probably do it within this month now...early September and go back to them again. There is service delivery programs in Blikkiesdorp, there are some programs that some departments have in the area. But in terms of public participation for this year, we've done one community meeting.

RESEARCHER: Is it a fairly new process in Blikkiesdorp?

RESPONDENT: In terms of public participation?

RESEARCHER: Yes

RESPONDENT: Well, it was due to a need that arose. The community came with some grievances, and we responded.

RESEARCHER: Specific to participation? Or we're they service delivery orientated?

RESPONDENT; Service delivery issues, but because it was multi-disciplinary in terms of, it was social development issues, and health issues, and housing issues. Because of that, it would be best for us to call a meeting with the people.

RESEARCHER: So it went, there was a grievance with service delivery, and the response was participation?

RESPONDENT: yes.

RESEARCHER: And then the meetings, that included different departments like housing, water...

RESPONDENT: The specific departments that we're mentioned in the grievances.

RESEARCHER: ok, and in terms of the community,.

RESPONDENT: Look, they are divided up into blocks, so we had block leaders, and I asked...we've got our staff working in the area as well, and we asked the guy who does monitoring and evaluation with the health department (because he also works with the people), we also took his list so we can ensure we not just going to one group and then tomorrow then we going to hear that we didn't speak to the other group. So we did ask housing to provide of people that they know, that they work with, we've asked the NGO that's been working with them as well, MyLife to give us a list, and we asked health to give us a list as well and then we combined that.

RESEARCHER: What was expected of the meeting?

RESPONDENT: For me, I think the understanding was; we needed to establish first of all that look, the city has service delivery mechanisms in place in Blikkiesdorp, there are toilets, there are taps, there are structures, you know what I'm saying? There's two clinics in Delft. So we needed to establish, look according to international and national standards, you need to have 5 families for 1 toilet, and we've got 4 families for 1 toilet. So we needed to establish the cities side. And we needed to establish, according to those grievances, we needed the community to establish, yes thank you. You know that you've got that, but there are areas that are not exactly sufficient for the community in their own experience and that also needed to be highlighted. SO where they would say yes, you have over exceeded the international standard, which is 4 families per toilet. But you don't actually know how many people are living in those toilets, so due to that, then its not sufficient. So we need to get that kind of dialogue happening. So now we need to put that back the relevant people, who can then do something about it. So that has taken a bit of time, we cant just go back, we want to come back with something substantial, so that is why the time has been a bit..probably a month or more that we haven't gotten back to them yet, they've asked me, they've phoned me, and I've been honest in terms of the complications, so at least there has been some communication around that, because when we left there, we said "hold us accountable". Its not easy though, this is not the only project we have, we are all 4 public participation practitioners. Theres a lot on each of our plates. But we'll get to them as soon as we can, its not that we aren't prioritising them, its just that we have a lot to do. And everything is important, and everything is a priority. And the departments are coming to us, and they think their processes are a priority, and the politicians and their priorities.

RESEARCHER: What is the communities role in this participation process, what is expected of them?

RESPONDENT: Well they need to communicate the areas that they not happy with, you know. They asked for that platform so we provided them with that platform. But they obviously want something to be done about it, we've come back and that needs to be filtered to the right people so that we can get back to them.

RESEARCHER: So do you feel that they are quite active?

RESPONDENT: Most definitely they are active. I know that there are a lot of NGOs that have been speaking up for them. I don't know if its NGOS using the situation to make a name for themselves, so that they can get funding and whatever, but never the less we listen to them. You know in my file I've got every time that Blikkiesdorp has appeared in the newspaper...you know so Ive used that also to keep us going in terms of Blikkiesdorp. They have a role as citizens, to make their needs known. And they are definitely exercising that right to speak up for themselves.

RESEARCHER: Do you feel like they are taken seriously in this process?

RESPONDENT: Most definitely. Just because time frames are not as fast as people would expect, doesn't mean that they are not prioritised, that they are not important. It just means that everything that comes through your desk is important, and you need to give everything time.

RESEARCHER: What is participation aimed at? Is it aimed to find problem areas and then address those needs?

RESPONDENT: I wouldn't say that, probably it would because it would highlight that. I think the purpose was to create a platform where the city and the community were talking to one another. That's the most important thing. From there, to take those results to leadership.

RESEARCHER: The focus is really the dialogue, making sure that there's an honest conversation happening.

RESPONDENT: yes.

RESEARCHER: Do you think its achieving that goal?

RESPONDENT: I think we did achieve that goal, its now just about going back to them. The feedback process. And they obviously don't want some blanket excuse. Lets not rush things then. Lets take our time so that we can go back with something.

RESEARCHER: Were you in the meeting

RESPONDENT: I chaired the meeting

RESEARCHER: Did you find it a useful experience?

RESPONDENT: Most definitely.

RESEARCHER: In what way?

RESPONDENT: In terms of the representative departments, it was a first for them. For the community they felt satisfied that at least we came and made an effort. They all complimented us afterwards. We are also in the process of doing a satisfaction survey with them, we have to take that up to our leaders as well. I think the mere fact that we organised the meeting shows that we have an interest. We could have just ignored it and sent an email saying whatever, we do have these various services and left it at that. We have toilets, we have taps, we have police vans coming that. We could have done that, but we didn't. We went to them.

RESEARCHER: So it wasn't a combative kind of space, it was very co-operative.

RESPONDENT: Yes, I think it could have gotten like that, but I think we kept it well in control, and when we elaborated on the purpose of the meeting, there was an understanding.

RESEARCHER: What was the purpose?

RESPONDENT: I said that. The dialogue.

RESEARCHER: And these services were specific to what The City Of Cape Town is responsible for?

RESPONDENT: That's another thing, we also clarified that this is what the city is doing, this is provincial, and this is national. Because that's the thing, people don't know that.

RESEARCHER: Is it difficult to encourage participation in a bureaucratic system because you have different departments and different levels of governance...is there any kind of conflict between the processes?

RESPONDENT: your question is very loaded

RESPONDENT: The thing is that we can only answer in terms of our competency. First of all housing has their own competency, and the money is filtered through to various grants. And then local government, we just need to see that those services are delivered. That the money comes from national. And health, those are provincial services. So things like that need to be clarified. There's no shortages of water...looking at grievances, there were some things that were inflated. Like they

would say there's a cholera case, I mean there's no cholera in Blikkiesdorp. You know, so things like that...and yet people put that on a DVD and that goes to America or where ever, so I think the clarification was important in this meeting as well. So I think that's why the community leaders felt it was worth their while, we came there. We didn't bamboozle them, we spoke honestly. And we shared what we are doing, and we shared our competency, that type of thing so...and there were no promises that we cant stick to, and that's why it didn't become confrontational really. The control was there.

RESEARCHER: Do you think there is potential for like a partnership or a deeper level of participation in Blikkiesdorp

RESPONDENT: I do think so from a departmental level. In terms of recommendations that we making, that would go deeper as per department. They are working there on the ground, Im not. The monitoring and evaluation guys that go in to make sure the taps are working, the law enforcement guys who have a mobile unit set up or something.

RESEARCHER: So there is a lot of individual departments picking up the participation mandate?

RESPONDENT: Because they do it for enhancing their service delivery.

1.3 Extract from Observation notes

29/07/11

I went into Blikkies at about 11 to go interview a contact. I found myself sitting in on a community leader meeting. There was a chairperson in the meeting, and other leaders took turns talking. The leaders were weary of partnering with NGOs, and there was repeated reference to the idea that they would not become puppets. In the meeting there was a lot of alternative development paradigm rhetoric. There was talk of solidarity and partnerships rather than charity. They had attended a workshop previously and were talking about how the group of community leaders require more structure. The meeting itself showed me that there is some evidence that there could be participation with residents through community leaders. They are very eager to participate, and they are willing to attend workshops and training programs if need be. They are well respected within the community. The downside is that there is a lack of structure within the community leadership; they need to decide what kind of structure would be feasible for them.

There was a discussion of outside perspectives of Blikkiesdorp residents. One of the leaders said a person brought in from "outside" said they were surprised by how clean her house was inside; the leader said it was like a slap in her face. Then someone said, "people think because we live in tins, we are made of tin". The phrase seriously resonated with me. It refers to the fact that people assimilate structural poverty and identities of residents; they become their poverty, and the residents are fully aware of this. Another thing that struck me was how people talk about "outside" people. It's like Blikkies residents feel totally cut off from the rest of the city.

Community leaders were telling me that the amount of violence in the camp was escalating. They said that people are bringing in drugs and it's been a problem. It seems like community/vigilant justice is on the rise in Blikkies, and it seems directly related to the fact that the police are very ineffective.

In terms of the surroundings, Blikkiesdorp was really cold today. I was warmly dressed, but I was still cold inside. When it rains, the structures leak, which is a big problem. People are very vulnerable to the weather, and community leaders keep telling me that the elderly and the young die in winter because they get sick.

1.4 Extract from Observation notes: Experience with Service providers

12/08/11

Today I went to go interview a field worker in Blikkiesdorp. I sat in the back of his car while himself and his superior drove around Blikkiesdorp checking to make sure things were fine with housing. They check to make sure the infrastructures ok and to make sure no one has illegally invaded homes or moved in other people illegally. The first thing I noticed is that the field worker is well known and well respected in the community. He was greeted by most of the people we passed, and he seemed to know them. People kept stopping him to rely information about other people or practices or to ask him questions. He was always friendly and courteous with residents, and residents seem to confide in him and are willing to look into things if he asks. We drove around Blikkiesdorp, and talked. The gang violence is still prevelant, but things have calmed down over the past week. They showed me a toilet with a door missing, and when I asked them how quickly the doors are stolen, they said "sometimes the same day". They also talked about the fact that the state has spent a lot on maintenance in Blikkies, largely because things are vandilised and broken often. It was interesting to hear it from this perspective because you can understand the frustration from the city officials; they feel like they spend all their time fixing/replacing things that community members destroy, so there isn't even time to upgrade the settlement. They took me past the park to show me that the swings had been stolen, so had metal pipes from the slide. The said that people sell these things for scrap, and the same is true of toilet doors that are stolen. The cisterns are also repeatedly stolen. The swings were there a few months ago, so the park must have been "stripped" recently. We stopped by a house, because someone reported that people had illegally moved into a structure. When we went to go check it out, the structure was empty. The neighbours were helpful to the city officials, and told them where they could find the residents. The entire exchange was totally polite and respectful; it had no elements of a combative, resistant or co-opted dynamic.

After driving around Blikkiesdorp for about an hour, they wanted to show me the Mfuleni TRA near the N2. They said that is was an example of a successful TRA, and said that Blikkiesdorp was the first TRA built by the city in the Western Cape. They said they had learnt from their mistakes, and had built this TRA differently. I was shocked when I got there because it is so much better. The structures are bigger (26 square metres instead of 18), and the structures are painted. The area is so much cleaner. There are fewer people within the settlement, and people seem happier. There were also no children running around (which is always a problem in Blikkiesdorp). The Mfuleni TRA is clearly built much better, and residents seem much happier.

The field officers also showed me a provincial TRA which look very nice. I'm noticing more and more how the decentralisation of the state plays out in practice; there are different TRAs in Cape Town, and some of them seem nice, while others are terrible, and it seems like the same party (the state) is responsible for all of them, but in practice local government is in charge of one while provincial is in charge of another. The same is true of the responsibilities of the state which are split between local government, national and provincial departments. It means that approach to service delivery requires not only that local governance partners with the community, but that all the levels of state partner with community.

Spending the day with the two field workers helped my perspective. I've only really been spending time with the community, so it's easy to fall into a completely biased idea of everything. The perspective of the city officials lets me see how frustrating it is to try and fulfil the needs of the community. I keep hearing repeatedly that the problems in Blikkiesdorp with regard to service delivery are largely attributed to the social problems like crime and apathy.

University of Cape Town

1.5 Meeting Minutes

DATE:	1 SEPTEMBER 2011		
ACTIVITY	EASTERN /TYGERBERG REGION PARTNERSHIP PROJECTS MEETING		
VENUE:	CRECHE, BURUNDI, MFULENI		
MEMBERS:	COMMUNITIES, ISN, CORC & CITY		
PRESENT:			
	CITY	MSELENI	
	ISN	BALENI	
	BETTER LIFE	PHOLA PARK	
	LOS ANGELOS	GARDEN CITY	
	GREEN PARK	SOPHAKAMA	
	CONSTANTIA	SHUKUSHUKUMA	
	FREEDOM FARM	STRONG YARD	
	BURUNDI	NYAKATHISA	
	SANTINI		
<u>CHAIRPERSON:</u>	Nkokheli Ncambele	<u>Partnership Secretary:</u>	
	Vuyani Mnyango		
<u>Opening by Prayer & Welcoming by the Chairperson</u>			
<u>Introductions by the members of the meeting</u>			
<u>Apologies:</u>	from City – ISM will not be available		
	from City – ISM is on leave.		
Approval of the Minutes – the minutes were approved by the meeting.			
Matters Arising			
<u>AGENDAS:</u>			
	i. Community Update on their issues		
	ii. Community Comments, Questions and Suggestions		
	iii. Response by the City		
	iv. Set of the Date for the next Meeting		

a. **Community Update on their issues**

<u>Settlement Name:</u>	<u>Issues:</u>	<u>Action by:</u>
1. <u>Los Angeles</u>	<u>Solid Waste:</u> The community is very dirty due to the fact that only one person has to clean the entire community and do all the collection of blue bags and take them to the	Reporter: Noludwe

	<p>container.</p> <p><u>Water & Sanitation:</u> On taps, there is a huge problem on the community as they had to fetch water in Driftsands as their pipes had been broken. The other problem is on the toilet block as they are located in one area but the entire community cannot use them after hours they will have to use bush. In the toilet block only 5 toilets are functioning and the others are not, they need attention. The community had complained previously about the toilets that were built close to the houses</p> <p><u>Permits:</u> The City – ISM had promised to issue permits for renovations and extensions plus to check the structures to be renovated but that had not happened yet. The community is having a problem around that and need assistance.</p> <p><u>Flooding:</u> There are about 70 victims during the recent heavy rains that were affected.</p> <p><u>Access Roads:</u> There are no access roads due to the flood areas in this community and they need attention of the City.</p> <p><u>UISP Meeting:</u> This community is still looking forward in having the meeting with of City – ISM where there will be Los Angeles, Green Park, Freedom Farm & Malawi Camp.</p>	
2. <u>Better Life</u>	<p><u>Solid Waste:</u> They don't have a problem around the cleaning of their community but they want to know the contractor that is cleaning their area as they requested in the previous meetings.</p> <p><u>Water & Sanitation:</u> The broken taps that were reported to the City had been fixed by Water & Sanitation Department. The community had asked for the Mshengu toilets with no door at the back but with the buckets inside as they are dangerous to the children.</p> <p><u>Electricity:</u> The community is looking and waiting for the relocation but if that will be after a long time they want electricity.</p>	Reporter: Nondumiso
3. <u>Green Park</u>	<p><u>Solid Waste:</u> There are no problems so far in this community.</p>	Reporter: Nosipho

	<p><u>Water & Sanitation:</u> Taps have no problem as they are functioning properly. Mshengu toilets are being cleaned once in a month and that is not good in people's health and need attention.</p> <p><u>Electricity:</u> They are still waiting for the UISP meeting on the relocation where will be sharing information with this community.</p> <p><u>Flooding:</u> One victim had been moved to a safe space although there are few victims that are affected during heavy rains.</p> <p><u>Access Roads:</u> The access roads had been fixed although they there are potholes that need attention of the City.</p> <p><u>Enumerations:</u> had asked the leadership to do a door to door survey to the entire community and the leadership had done that. In a meeting that was in Los Angelos they handed over the community information to & he also gave it to but the community will get back their information from who is working for the City. Why Greg is not sharing the information with his partners /City officials?</p>	<p>Additions by Mr. Zako</p>
<p>4. <u>Freedom Farm</u></p>	<p><u>Solid Waste:</u> There are no problems in this community so far as the community is being cleaned.</p> <p><u>Water & Sanitation:</u> Taps had been fixed that were reported and they had asked for the addition of other taps as they are not enough. D Section is still having no toilets and they want the City to provide toilets to this section as they are using the bush.</p> <p><u>Electricity:</u> They are looking forward to have a meeting with</p> <p><u>Verification of Database:</u> The people who had been approved had attended the Consumer Education session. The community is concerned on the remaining number of people, they want to know from the City what plans are in place and they need assistance.</p> <p><u>Permits:</u> People from the community are getting permits from the City – ISM without of the leadership being informed by the City. These permits are being signed by the City – ISM officials like and Peterson but this is</p>	

	<p>causing a big division in this community.</p> <p>UISP Meeting: The community is looking at having a meeting withas is nowhere to be found and the problem is database because people that had stayed long time don't appear in the list and that is a big problem that needs to be solved.</p>	Additions by Veliswa
5. <u>Burundi</u>	<p>Solid Waste: The community is still dirty and that is a big problem as there is no proper cleaning by the contractor.</p> <p>Water & Sanitation: Taps are functioning but need to be added. Toilets also need to be added as the people are in danger as they are using the bush even at night times and rape is increasing these days.</p> <p>Electricity: Crime is increasing each day as it is dark in this community. Also they are waiting for to give them more details on their community. The community is looking forward to get the high mass light and they had attended the meeting with Electricity Department and apply for the flood lights.</p>	Reporter: Noluthando
6. <u>Santini</u>	<p>Solid Waste: No cleaning that is happening including the issuing of the blue bags the community is dirty.</p> <p>Water & Sanitation: Taps need to added but the toilets are almost enough for the community.</p> <p>Electricity: There are no promises at all by the City.</p> <p>Flooding: There are no victims that had been reported to the leadership so far.</p> <p>Access Roads: They are not a problem at all.</p>	Reporter: Thanduxolo
7. <u>Phola Park</u>	<p>Solid Waste: The refuse container had been located across the road and they want it within their community & the cleaning is done properly.</p> <p>Water & Sanitation: No problems on the taps & toilets so far.</p> <p>Flooding: There are victims of floods during heavy rains and in some of those houses affected there are old people that are staying there.</p>	
8. <u>Garden City</u>	<p>Solid Waste: The community is not clean as the person meant to clean does not manage the entire community &</p>	Reporter: George

	<p>the community is dirty.</p> <p><u>Water & Sanitation:</u> 3x taps are reported to be broken plus 15x toilets are not functioning.</p> <p><u>Electricity:</u> flood light had been fixed by the City.</p> <p><u>Access Roads:</u> They need attention of the City.</p>	
9. <u>Constantia</u>	<p><u>Solid Waste:</u> No cleaning that is happening including the issuing of the blue bags the community is dirty.</p> <p><u>Water & Sanitation:</u> No changes (no taps & toilets) they are using the bush to help themselves.</p> <p><u>Electricity:</u> They have nothing.</p> <p><u>Access Roads:</u> They are not a problem because of their location to main road.</p>	
10. <u>Baleni Elibomvu</u>	<p><u>Number of Shacks:</u> 36 structures</p> <p><u>Solid Waste:</u> No cleaning at all it is dirty.</p> <p><u>Water & Sanitation:</u> No taps & toilets at all.</p> <p><u>Electricity:</u> They have nothing.</p> <p><u>Access Roads:</u> They are not a problem at all because they are located close to main road.</p>	
11. <u>Mseleni</u>	<p><u>Number of Shacks:</u> 29 structures</p> <p><u>Solid Waste:</u> No cleaning at all it is dirty.</p> <p><u>Water & Sanitation:</u> No taps and toilets at all.</p> <p><u>Access Roads:</u> They are not a problem at all because they are located close to main road.</p>	
12. <u>Strong Yard</u>	<p><u>Solid Waste:</u> No cleaning at all it is dirty.</p> <p><u>Water & Sanitation:</u> No taps and toilets at all.</p> <p><u>Access Roads:</u> They are not a problem at all because they are located close to main road.</p>	
13. <u>Nyakathisa</u>	<p><u>Number of Shacks:</u> 133 structures</p> <p><u>Solid Waste:</u> No cleaning at all it is dirty.</p> <p><u>Water & Sanitation:</u> No taps and toilets at all.</p>	

	<p><u>Access Roads:</u> They are not a problem at all because they are located close to main road.</p> <p><u>Canal:</u> A child was drowned while swimming in this canal and died immediately.</p>	
14. <u>Shukushukuma</u>	<p><u>Water & Sanitation:</u> Broken taps are 2 that need attention. One tap need to be relocated from where it is. Broken toilets are 7 that need attention. Metal toilet doors are being sold to the scrap yards and they want the green plastic doors.</p> <p><u>Electricity:</u> Flood light is highly needed in this community to add more light plus the City's Electricity Department had helped this community around this matter.</p> <p><u>Flooding:</u> Disaster had assisted this community by giving sand during heavy rains.</p>	Reporter: Ntobeko
15. <u>Sophakama</u>	<p><u>Solid Waste:</u> The cleaning is looking perfect at this moment.</p> <p><u>Water & Sanitation:</u> Taps and toilets are highly needed by this community.</p> <p><u>Electricity:</u> They want electricity as they huge amounts of money to Driftsands formal houses.</p>	

Response & Briefing by the City – ISM Stanley

<u>Settlement Name</u>	<u>Issues</u>	<u>Action by:</u>
a. <u>Los Angeles</u>	<p>For the 2x taps that are not working that need to be reported immediately and that does not have to wait to be reported in this meeting. Water & Sanitation Department was supposed to in this meeting to give a feed back on the taps that are located in the low lying area of this community.</p> <p>For the permits there are few that had been approved and issued to this</p>	Water & Sanitation Department

	community.	
b. <u>Better Life</u>	The community needs to be part of the cleaning but they must tender in order to be involved. For the relocation process they will be a delay which is it won't be time that was expected.	Solid Waste Department XXXXXX to gather information on relocation.
c. <u>Green Park</u>	Toilets are not regularly cleaned by Mshengu. ISN need to assist in terms of organizing a meeting with so that he can respond to these issues. On the counting of the shacks him as Stanley he has no clear idea but he will follow that up.	Water & Sanitation Department Vuyani & Nkokheli XXXXXXXXXXXX
d. <u>Freedom Farm</u>	D Section is located on the ACSA land and it cannot be serviced but that can be shared via the regular meetings they had with ACSA. For permits suggested that this should be done via the community leadership not the ISM office to do it alone. The access roads will be followed via the call centre. Greg will have to respond to the issue of the remaining people.	Leadership to follow up XXXXXXXXXX XXXXXXX XXXXXXXXXX
e. <u>Burundi</u>	Piles of the rubbish will be reported to Solid Waste. Taps & toilets will be reported immediately. Flood lights will also be taken into consideration where the leadership should visit Electricity Department as they didn't attend. For electricity need to have a meeting with this community to	Solid Waste Department Water & Sanitation Department Leadership XXXX

	respond.	
f. <u>Santini</u>	For the issuing of the blue bags he will follow that with Solid Waste. For the 3 houses that are affected during heavy rains he will send someone to assess the situation.	Solid Waste XXXXXXXXXX
g. <u>Phola Park</u>	Solid waste, taps & toilets are not a problem. Issue of flooding need to be followed. Assistance on electricity.	XXXXXXXXXX & Leadership XXXXXXXXXX
h. <u>Garden City</u>	Broken taps & toilets will be reported. Flood lights had been fixed. Roads need attention.	Water & Sanitation Department Leadership XXXXXXXXXX
i. <u>Constantia, Strong Yard, Nyakathisa, Mseleni & Baleni</u>	He will forward all these community issues to the Call Centre for URGENT attention.	XXXXXXXXXX
j. <u>Shukushukuma</u>	2x taps will be reported. 7x toilets that are not functioning. Flood light is in progress.	Water & Sanitation Department Water & Sanitation Department

In briefing by Mzwanele Zulu

- The ISN held a meeting with the Mayor of the City of Cape Town where this is aiming at selling the idea & view of the ISN but that was through the City's – ISM Department.
- This will thus be done through an MOU (Memorandum Of Understanding) or MOA (Memory Of Agreement) between the Corc, ISN, City – ISM Department.
- This will help in terms of getting all the necessary departments that are working with the informal settlements that are within the City.

NEXT MEETING:

Date: XXXXXXXXXX 2011

Venue: Creche, Burundi, Mfuleni

Time: 11:00 – 13:00

1.6 Interview Schedule

Interview Schedule 1 for community leaders

Concept

What does participation mean to you?

What do you expect to come from public participation?

Processes

Are community leaders encouraged to interact with city officials?

In what ways do you and other community leaders “participate” in service delivery matters

Do you feel like you are being heard in meetings; does your input change anything?

Are meetings useful?

How are meetings useful?

Do you feel like the city is accountable to community leaders/residents?

Are there ever meetings/workshops/forums with The city officials?

What are these meetings like? Is there any procedure to them?

Are meetings regular?

What motivates meetings?

Do you keep other community members informed about what happens at meetings?

When you want to complain about services/have a suggestion about services who do you talk to?

Have you ever complained about services to officials? Do you feel like this was taken seriously/ changed anything

What has been you're experience with the city officials?

What was your experience of the PPU initiative meeting?

Does the ward councillor and ward council connect local government and community leaders?

Potential

Do you think public services would benefit from partnering with the community more?

Do you think there is potential for a partnership?

What has participation achieved in Blikkiesdorp?

What do you think participation could achieve in Blikkiesdorp?

Do you think that the city is working to increase/better participation?

Interview Schedule 2 for municipal managers

Concept

What does participation mean to you?

What do you expect from “participation”

Process

In what ways do you and other community leaders “participate” in service delivery matters

What mechanisms are in place to encourage “participation”

Are communities encouraged to partner with or interact with the city officials?

What are these experiences like; did you find them useful?

Have you ever met with the Blikkiesdorp community leaders?

How often do meetings happen?

Is there any kind of procedure for it?

Do you feel like community members are taken seriously?

Does the city try to gather information about Blikkiesdorp and Blikkiesdorp residents?

If people need to complain about services, what should they do?

What was your experience of the PPU initiated meeting?

Does the ward councillor and ward council connect local government and community leaders?

Potential

Do you think the city is trying to address the needs of Blikkiesdorp?

Do you think there is potential for a future partnership with the community?

What has participation achieved in Blikkiesdorp?

What do you think participation could achieve in Blikkiesdorp?

Do you think public services would benefit from partnering with the community more?

Interview schedule 3

Concept

What does “participation” mean to you?

Why does the city encourage participation in service delivery?

What is expected from “participation”

Process

How do community members “participate” in service delivery matters?

What mechanisms are in place to encourage “participation”

Have you ever met with the Blikkiesdorp community leaders?

How often do meetings happen?

Is there any kind of procedure for it?

Do you think it would be valuable to partner with the community to find out what they think about service delivery?

Does the city try to gather information about Blikkiesdorp and Blikkiesdorp residents?

If people need to complain about services, what should they do?

Can you tell me about the recent Public Participation Unit meeting in Blikkiesdorp?

Does the ward councillor and ward council connect local government and community leaders?

Potential

Do you think the city is trying to encourage/better participation in Blikkiesdorp?

Do you think there is potential for a future partnership with the community in Blikkiesdorp?

What has participation achieved in Blikkiesdorp?

What do you think participation could achieve in Blikkiesdorp?

Do you think public services would benefit from partnering with the community more?

****Please note that this is a flexible interview schedule aimed to elicit everyday experiences and understandings of participation.**